Univ. of
Toronto
Library

P
FLE
E

The Edinburgh Review

or Critical Journal

JANUARY, 1920 ——— APRIL, 1920

To be continued Quarterly

Edited by HAROLD COX

JUDEX DAMNATUR CUM NOCENS ABSOLVITUR
Publius Syrus

VOL. 231

157534
3/12/20

LONGMANS, GREEN & CO.
London, Bombay, Calcutta, and Madras
LEONARD SCOTT PUBLICATION COMPANY, New York
1920

Contents of Vol. 231

No. 471 — JANUARY, 1920

		PAGE
The Church and Socialism	The BISHOP OF HEREFORD	1
Latin Prose Fiction	The Lord ERNLE, M.V.O.	26
Samuel Butler	EDMUND GOSSE, C.B.	45
Bird-Watching as a Hobby	HUGH ELLIOT	63
An Eighteenth-Century Cleric-Scientist	J. PAUL DE CASTRO	78
The Calcutta University Commission	ERNEST BARKER	97
Egypt and Palestine	Major LINDSAY BASHFORD	115
Industrialism in Wales	Rev. J. VYRNWY MORGAN, D.D.	134
The Legend of 'Perfide Albion'	Prof. W. ALISON PHILLIPS	143
Parliament and Finance	J. A. R. MARRIOTT, M.P.	166
Nationalisation	EDITOR	186

No. 472 — APRIL, 1920

The Peace Conference and the Adriatic Question		209
The Future of International Law	RONALD F. ROXBURGH	232
England and America	A. MAURICE LOW	251
Science and Fruit Growing	Prof. FREDERICK KEEBLE, C.B.E., F.R.S.	263
The Will in Nature	A. WYATT TILBY	284
Some Feminine Autobiographies	ORLO WILLIAMS, M.C.	303
The Novels of Joseph Conrad	Captain STEPHEN GWYNN	318
Physiologus of Alexandria	JAMES CARLILL	340
The First Phase at Sea	DAVID HANNAY	352
The Government and Wages		374
Discontent in Industry	Sir LYNDEN MACASSEY, K.C., D.Sc.	393

The Edinburgh Review

JANUARY, 1920 No. 471

THE CHURCH AND SOCIALISM

1. **Christianity and Industrial Problems**, being the Report of the Archbishops' Fifth Committee of Inquiry. S.P.C.K. 1919.
2. **The Division of the Product of Industry**: An Analysis of National Income before the War. By ARTHUR L. BOWLEY, Sc.D. Oxford: University Press. 1919.
3. **The Church and Industrial Questions.** By the Rev. ARTHUR C. HEADLAM, D.D. A Sermon preached before the University of Cambridge. S.P.C.K. 1919.
4. **Industry and Trade.** By ALFRED MARSHALL. Macmillan. 1919.
5. **Christianity and Economic Science.** By W. CUNNINGHAM. John Murray. 1914.
6. **Christianity and the Social Crisis.** By WALTER RAUSCHENBUSCH. The Macmillan Company. 1907.
7. **The Publications of the Church Socialist League.**
8. **Christianity and the Social Order.** By the Rev. R. J. CAMPBELL. Chapman & Hall. 1907.

NOTHING is more plainly written on the page of history than the slightness of the connexion between the ideals of social reformers and the social changes which they succeed in effecting. It would, perhaps, be true to say that the loftier the ideal, the more pathetically inadequate the achievement. Nor is the reason obscure. It lies in the idealist's contempt for experience, in his disregard of the conditions under which men think and act, in his impatience with the inability of average human nature to absorb and endorse

his ideas, in his assumption not only that 'the end justifies 'the means,' but also that it qualifies the agents.

The Anabaptists, whose name lingers still in the scornful allusion of the XXXVIIIth Article, provide a striking illustration. They were distinguished among the reformers of the sixteenth century by the loftiness of their social ideals, and, with some notorious exceptions, by the sincerity of their leaders. It has been said of them with justice that 'they were the 'modern men of their time,' for in many particulars they anticipated the beliefs of the future. In an age of violence, they preached the wrongfulness of war: in a time of persecution, they proclaimed the duty of toleration: in a society marked by the extremes of pride and poverty, they denounced individual ownership and advocated communism. With the Bible as their teacher, they worked out a conception of social order in which the dreams of modern Socialists were expressed in religious phraseology. Yet the practical outcome of Anabaptist enthusiasm was a squalid and immoral anarchy which, save for its veneer of Biblical nomenclature, bears a curious resemblance to Russian Bolshevism. Munster, the scene of the Anabaptist experiment in social reconstruction, has passed into literature as the synonym for a brutal and degraded communism. 'The name became a by-word and a hissing through-'out Europe.'

Religion and politics cannot really be severed, for every religious man is also in some sense a politician, and every politician is, in some sense, religious. If, moreover, the dominant political factor in a community become Christian, the effect must needs be considerable in the community's life. Constantine's conversion implied the christianising of the Roman Empire. Medieval Christendom was the perfect example of christianised politics. Establishment, as it exists in England, may be said to perpetuate within a limited area and under modern conditions the medieval identification of religion and politics. In this way religion penetrates society, consecrating and exalting it, but not ordinarily innovating, disturbing, or revolutionising it. Christianity accepts the existing situation, pours a new spirit into existing institutions, and silently enables a gradual but continuous improvement in existing society. Its genius is conservative, cohesive, and constructive. Its action

is that indicated significantly by the metaphors of the 'salt' and the 'leaven.'

While thus in society Christianity has normally been the least revolutionary of forces, accommodating itself to every variety of political system and economic order, in individuals it has not rarely been the most. Conversion has been sudden, dramatic, complete. It changes the converted man's point of view, alters his perspectives of duty, provides new objectives for his effort. If, then, religious conviction shall enter directly into politics, the result must needs be considerable. An economic programme may acquire the character of a religious creed, and draw to its support the same passionate ardour as has sustained a thousand martyrdoms. Sincerity, however, is no guarantee against error, nor can the tenderness of the conscience secure the clearness of the intellect. Conviction shades off into all degrees of self-delusion, and consists with all measures of ignorance. If the secular cause, which religion has consecrated, be morally and economically sound, it is difficult to overstate the advantage to the world which follows from its association with personal conviction. A noble army of social reformers has found the inspiration of unwearied public labours and sacrifices in this source. They may be set in the scale against the sinister succession of fanatics who have infused the fierceness of religious zeal into the processes of secular life, and borne down the restraining considerations of reason, knowledge, and equity, by the impetuous but irrelevant rhetoric of a passionate faith. Was it with reference to such effects of His religion that the Divine Founder of Christianity said that He had not come to send peace on the earth but a sword? At least it can hardly be doubted that these words might serve to describe one aspect of Christian history.

A parallel has often been suggested between the sixteenth century and the twentieth, and with considerable justification. Both ages have the aspect of an epoch of revolution succeeding an age of discovery: in both, an economic change is associated with an intellectual movement: in both, the existing institutions of society provoke the fiercest resentment. In the retrospect the Reformation is seen to be less respectable than it appeared to its own agents. Will as much be said of the economic revolution which is now proceeding? There were

Reformers then who were moved by the loftiest and least selfish motives, and there are Socialists now who are swayed by altruistic dreams; but who can doubt that many Protestants were then, and many Socialists are now, inflamed by the sordid passions of greed and envy. The religious movement of the sixteenth century reflected, and in a sense inspired, the rise of the middle class into power and dominance. Is the rise of the 'proletariat' into political supremacy now to be similarly conditioned by a religious movement? It is surely an odd paradox that the 'Church Socialists,' who revile the Protestant Reformers as the chief agents in the triumph of the middle class, are themselves protagonists in a revolution which confessedly aims at the triumph of another class, self-styled the 'proletariat.'

The sixteenth century was a theological age, therefore the 'class-war' expressed itself in a religious revolution: the twentieth century is an age of secularism, therefore the class-war expresses itself in a social revolution, in which the religious factor is secondary and parasitic. But, as we have seen, religion interposes directly in politics at its peril. The process of social change, which may be natural and necessary, is inflamed and degraded by fanaticism. In the age of the Reformation the darkest chapters are those which disclose the closest association of religious and economic motives. The Peasants' Revolt in Germany, and the Religious Wars in France and the Low Countries may serve as sufficient examples. 'The real meaning 'of the present turmoil is that we are witnessing the birth pangs 'of a new order,' observes a leader-writer in the *Times*, and continues: 'There is no reason why it should not come into the 'world quite smoothly, if people understand what is happening, 'and do not offer an unreasoning opposition.' (*v. Times*, 19th November 1919.) But 'birth pangs' do not suggest an easy time. The metaphor is justified by a repeated experience which unites social change with dislocation, distress, and disorder. At least we may be sure that no degree of complaisance in those whom the new order depresses and ruins, and no ardour of welcome in those whom it exalts and enriches, can make its birth calm and painless, if in itself it violate the moral law and conflict with the principles of sound economy.

We propose in this article to examine the present relations

of the Church and socialism in England. The subject is rendered difficult by the ambiguity which attaches to the crucial terms. What is meant by the Church? What is meant by socialism? It must suffice, in this discussion, to use both terms in generally accepted senses. We are concerned with broad principles, not with specific projects.

A few months ago there was published an important and well-written tractate entitled 'Christianity and Industrial Problems.' It is the Report of a Committee (one of five) appointed by the two Archbishops in connexion with the 'National Mission,' which had been organised and carried through during the war. The Archbishop of Canterbury, in a short preface, explains the genesis of the Report, and the measure of its authority :—

'And now, in 1918, the five Reports are in our hand. They are not official documents. But whether we accept the conclusions or not, they have the high authority which belongs to the opinions of specially qualified men and women who have devoted long months to their elaboration. The roadway to right knowledge and effective action is now open. It is a roadway which is offered not to those only who approach it as churchmen and churchwomen, but to the English people as a whole.'

In spite of his Grace's disclaimer of an official character for this document, there can be no doubt that it is being generally treated as authoritative. The distributing machine of the Church is being fully employed to circulate it. With the Archbishop's approval, its substance has been issued broadcast in a series of leaflets, where the proportions of the doctrine are largely lost by the isolation of the paragraphs. It is probable that this Report will give colour and direction to Anglican thought on industrial questions, and it will go far (as we shall show later) to turn English religious opinion into Socialist grooves. Not unnaturally, the 'Church Socialist League' gave it a cordial welcome. At the annual conference in May 1919, it was unanimously agreed :—

'That the Church Socialist League welcomes the fundamental principles of the Report of the Archbishops' Committee of Inquiry on Christianity and Industrial Problems, *as involving an absolute condemnation of capitalism and the wage system.* It declares that the time has come for the Church to take sides in social issues, and that, *in view of the findings of the Report, there can be but one side for it to take.*'

A careful study of the Report will, on the whole, justify this

language. But first, since the Archbishop bases its authority on the special qualifications of its authors, we must make sure that we do not underrate or misconceive the weight which the Report acquires from this source. Who, then, are the authors of this Report? They are twenty-eight in number, and consist of nine clergymen, including four bishops (Winchester, Lichfield, Peterborough, and Oxford), seventeen laymen, and two unmarried ladies. Most of the names are wholly unknown to us, and, we should suppose, to the British public, but the four Bishops are prominent 'Christian Socialists,' and the two best-known laymen, Messrs. Tawney and Lansbury, are Socialists out and out. The Master of Balliol brings an academical element into the Committee, and the two members of Parliament, Lord Henry Bentinck and Mr. W. C. Bridgeman, are excellent examples of that interesting type of Conservative which sets little store by party ties, and concerns itself mainly with social questions. It would seem that the Primate in selecting the Committee followed the bad practice of modern prime ministers by making personal interest in the subject of inquiry the principle of selection rather than technical knowledge or recognised impartiality. The Report is exactly what might have been expected from its authors. It is eloquent, interesting, full of irrelevant learning, and in substance and effect a Socialist tract. The Bishop of Winchester's Introduction indicates the general character of the document:—

'The Report represents the belief that the time requires a new beginning on the part of the Church in defining its attitude to the economic and social life of the nation. To admit the necessity for a new beginning is to imply that something has been wrong in the past, and to acknowledge a need for repentance. The admission and the acknowledgment are both frankly made in the Report.'

The word 'Church,' it is explained, is used in the Report without any controversy, and in the largest possible sense, to mean 'all 'who profess and call themselves Christians.' It is to Christians, as such, that the 'call as of a trumpet' is addressed. Theological and denominational differences are irrelevant to a more fundamental obligation. On the plane of practical social reform a working unity can immediately be attained.

'What we desire to see in towns, counties, and villages, is the organisation of all who share the Christian profession to act together in

the name of Christ, for the making of a better England through the courageous application to the present day situation of the fundamental ethical principles of our religion.'

The new policy is thus presented as the true practical expression of 'the fundamental ethical principles' of Christianity. It can then only be rejected by a deliberate repudiation of Christian principle. 'A call as of a trumpet' summons the Church to realise the magnitude of its past error, and 'to be prepared to 'make the sacrifices involved in acting frankly and fully upon the 'principles of brotherhood and the equal value of every single 'human life.' It follows naturally that economic considerations are properly irrelevant to the argument. For the policy needs no support from science or experience. It is from above, 'a 'pattern in the mount,' having an inherent authority which cannot be challenged. Political economy is indeed referred to, but only as a self-confessed failure. The economists, it is suggested, have seen the error of their ways, know that they are helpless, and are now only eager to range themselves behind the banners of the Church. The Bishop of Winchester formulates the claim and discloses the method in a single paragraph.

'We shall have support from economics in starting from moral premises as the foundation of all economic arrangements and in demanding that their authority shall prevail. In such matters as those of the living wage, with adequate leisure and security of employment, the status of the worker within the industry in which he works, the provision of full opportunities for all of education, health, and housing, moral principles which Christianity creates or recognises claim to dictate "first charges" to which the economic process must submit and conform. To get these things conceded, or even adequately claimed, will require all the spiritual strength and courage which the Church can command by disinterestedness and prayer. But it is the way of faith, and to follow it is, we believe, to return to the best tradition of Christian teaching.'

The position of the older economists, we may observe, is gravely misunderstood, when they are credited with the absurd assumption that man is in such sense economic as to be neither moral nor spiritual. When, for the purpose of their study, they limited themselves to purely economic factors, they were but pursuing the normal and indispensable procedure of science. But they were not deluded by 'the false abstraction of the 'economic man moved only by motives of acquisition,' nor were they blind to the evils which flow from any disregard of other

and higher aspects of human nature. Dr. Marshall has pointed out how undeserved is the common reproach that opposition to the Factory Acts followed from the principles of the older economists, though much loose and misleading language was employed in the course of the controversy which might seem to justify it.

'These facts raise suspicion that the term "economists" must have been used in a sense in which it referred, not to the leading students of economics, but to politicians and others who affected to speak with economic knowledge, though with but slight foundation for their claim. It is to such men that Greville refers in a passage which has been frequently repeated, and has even been used by economic authority of the first rank as sole and sufficient evidence for the statement that English economists generally had eagerly opposed factory legislation. That is to say, it is taken to refer to the chief students of economics at the time, whereas, in fact, it refers exclusively to Members of Parliament.' (*v.* 'Industry and Trade,' p. 748.)

It is important to remove the popular prejudice against economic science, for the measure of success which any programme of social reform can secure will finally be determined by its fidelity to economic principles. We do not, and we cannot reasonably, 'start from moral premises,' when we are considering 'economic arrangements,' for (to borrow St. Paul's words) 'that is not first which is spiritual, but that which is 'natural.' First, the economic basis of society must be made secure, then the social fabric can be reared with confidence that it will be stable. To reverse the order, to postulate in advance what ought to be, and pronounce that it must be, before making sure that it can be, may be 'the way of faith,' but it is not the way of sane citizens. It is indeed patently absurd, and must almost certainly prove disastrous.

'First charges' on the 'economic process' are not worth much if the 'economic process' be unremunerative. Their excellence may be manifest, the loftiness of the motives by which they have been framed and formulated may be beyond question, but the hard fact that there is no fund out of which they shall be provided will remain, and will determine their fate. 'The living wage, with adequate leisure and security of employ-'ment,' and all the long list of desirable things which 'Christian' citizens are told to insist upon, are only possible if industry be sufficiently plentiful and remunerative to sustain the cost, that is,

if men will work to such effect, and under such conditions, that the product of their labours can provide all these terrestrial boons. In so far as they are intrinsically sound, they enter into the scheme of every good citizen's effort, and therein of the Christian's, who in this connexion is nothing other than a good citizen, but their claim is contingent, not absolute. It may be the good citizen's evident duty, and *a fortiori* the Christian's, to oppose the demand for what is economically unsound; or it may be his duty to insist that the destruction of the industry itself is preferable to its continuance under the only conditions which make it adequately remunerative. The question must be decided on its merits after a full review of all the relevant circumstances. It cannot be answered in advance by a sweeping generalisation about 'first charges,' to which the economic process must submit and conform. The 'economic process' is not so patient of benevolent manipulation as the Bishop thinks, nor are the items of the 'Labour' programme to be so readily identified with the irreducible requirements of Christianity.

That 'when Christian ethics and economic practice are at 'variance, the latter must be adapted to the former, not the 'former to the latter,' is, of course, a commonplace of Christian morals, but what is its bearing on the general question? Here is an industry—it is a familiar phenomenon—carried on with difficulty on a narrow margin of profit, a margin so narrow that any considerable increase of the working expenses, whether by raising wages, or by shortening hours, will render it totally unremunerative — what is the Christian employer's duty? Throughout the Report, it seems to be assumed that the volume of trade is secure, and that the products of industry are sufficient to satisfy the large programme of social reconstruction which is detailed at considerable length, and set forward as specifically Christian. Neither assumption is tenable. Not only is the greater part of our foreign trade held against rivals who are ever increasing in enterprise and efficiency, but the product of our industries as a whole is, as Professor Bowley has shown conclusively, insufficient to satisfy the demands of 'Labour.' Does Christianity really require economic suicide?

There is a dangerous confusion of thought running through the general argument. Much is true that is not properly relevant. In what sense is the undoubted truth of man's

spiritual equality to be correlated with the equally undoubted truth that for all terrestrial purposes men are amazingly unequal? When we are told that 'to treat human beings as instruments of 'production is morally wrong,' we must needs ask how else they can be treated when the remuneration of their labour has to be fixed, or their place in the process of industry to be determined? No doubt it is the case that human beings produce under conditions proper to themselves, and that, unless these are fairly considered, their efficiency will be impaired; but these considerations do not alter the fact that human beings, considered as factors in the process of industry, are, and are properly regarded as instruments of production. To a large extent, indeed, they can be simply replaced by machinery. A bad workman has no special claim for consideration because he is human, when the value of his work has to be appraised, though it were prudent in the employer if he made sure that the badness was not due to unsatisfactory conditions of labour. Macaulay, arguing for the Ten Hours' Bill in the House of Commons, spoke with equal eloquence and wisdom of the human agent of production:—

'Man, man is the great instrument that produces wealth. The natural difference between Campania and Spitzbergen is trifling when compared with the difference between a country inhabited by men full of bodily and mental vigour, and a country inhabited by men sunk in bodily and mental decrepitude. Therefore it is that we are not poorer but richer, because we have, through many ages, rested from our labour one day in seven. That day is not lost. While industry is suspended, while the plough lies in the furrow, while the Exchange is silent, while no smoke ascends from the factory, a process is going on quite as important to the wealth of nations as any process which is performed on more busy days. Man, the machine of machines, the machine compared with which all the contrivances of the Watts and the Arkwrights are worthless, is repairing and winding up, so that he returns to his labours on the Monday with clearer intellect, with livelier spirits, with renewed corporeal vigour. Never will I believe that what makes a population stronger, and healthier, and wiser, and better, can ultimately make it poorer. You try to frighten us by telling us that, in some German factories, the young work seventeen hours in twenty-four; that they work so hard that among thousands there is not one who grows to such a stature that he can be admitted into the army; and you ask whether, if we pass this Bill, we can possibly hold our own against such competition as this. Sir, I laugh at the thought of such competition. If ever we are forced to yield the foremost place among commercial nations, we shall yield it, not to a race of degenerate dwarfs, but to some people pre-eminently vigorous in body and in mind.' (*v.* Trevelyan's 'Life,' ch. x.)

The truth of Macaulay's words is beyond dispute. As an instrument of production, the worker, intelligently considered, has a very sufficient charter of rights. He must not be overworked, enfeebled by bad hygienic conditions, underfed, rendered listless and discontented. On no other condition can his efficiency in the full sense be guaranteed. So much is required, and so much economic science justifies him in demanding. So much, and no more. Whatever is demanded beyond the requirement of efficiency must be justified, if justified at all, by another plea than that of sound economy, and must be paid for out of another fund, if such there be, than that which the product of industry can provide. It is not easy to see what precise meaning can be attached to such sounding phrases as 'the 'sacredness of human life, the rightfulness of claims for liberty 'of development and for equality of opportunity and considera-'tion, the duty of mutual help and corporate service,' when they are employed in a discussion of industrial problems. The Report says justly that these are 'the indispensable and 'sovereign things,' but it does not explain to what they are indispensable, or where precisely they are sovereign. At least it is certain that their full attainment is too remote to enter into a discussion of present duty. If they can be attained on earth at all, there must be a long process of individual regeneration. No adjustments and reconstructions of society could of themselves secure them. 'The kingdom of God cometh not with 'observation: neither shall they say, Lo, here! or There! for, lo, 'the kingdom of heaven is within you.'

Meanwhile, attempts to 'hasten the kingdom' by political action, however well intentioned and advocated on the loftiest religious grounds, may well defeat the object of those who make them. The late Archdeacon Cunningham, who spoke with the twofold authority of an economist and a moral philosopher, uttered no superfluous warning to the enthusiasts for social equality.

'There seems to be a real danger lest, by attempts to introduce equality, the complicated social system which at present exists may be so disorganised that the mechanism of production would be put out of order, and that the effect would be to diminish the aggregate of goods in the community, and to reduce rather than increase the share of the very poor. If equality were introduced in such a form as to do away with the division of labour, the total produce of labour would be

reduced: there would necessarily be new conditions for the administration of capital, and these might not be advantageous, while credit might vanish altogether.' (*v.* 'Christianity and Economic Science,' p. 88.)

The Report claims to be written by Christian men for Christian men, and it suggests that Christians, as such, have in their religion the key to a right handling of existing industrial problems. They are not content with what no Christian would dispute—a general guidance, a provision of large principles of which the right application must be slowly discovered in the school of experience. They insist upon a teaching clear enough not to be mistaken by any man of goodwill, and relevant enough to bear directly on the existing situation. The history of Christian thought on social relationships is reviewed with much learning, and a marked sympathy with the patristic and medieval phases of social development, in which the complexity and vastness of modern industry were unknown, and the religious direction of economic activity was comparatively simple. These are what the Bishop of Winchester means by 'the best tradition of Christian teaching' to which he would have us 'return.' A very hostile, and in our judgment unfair, description of the industrial revolution, which inaugurated the modern epoch, leads up to the present situation, and here the Report begins to take a distinctly revolutionary note.

'The solution of the industrial problem involves, in short, not merely the improvement of individuals, but a fundamental change in the spirit of the industrial system itself.'

The writer—it is said that Mr. Tawney was responsible for drafting the Report—cannot conceal the repugnance which the spectacle of existing society stirs in his mind. He can see nothing in it but the scandal of a shameless inequality, and the working of a cruel and soulless machine organised with demonic subtlety to degrade, depress, and divide those who come within its action. It needs not to question that there is much in our industrial society which is profoundly unsatisfactory, very much that to a considering Christian must be deeply painful, in order to condemn this sweeping condemnation as unmerited and misleading. The Report invokes the condemnation of Christians on existing society.

'We would urge our fellow Christians to ask themselves once more whether an economic system, which produces the striking, and as we

think, excessive inequalities of wealth which characterise our present society is one which is compatible with the spirit of Christianity, or in which a Christian community ought to acquiesce.'

We are not carried far by admitting that the indictment is true. The world, as we see it to-day, is very far from what it would be if the spirit of Christianity governed its arrangements. None the less it may be our duty to acquiesce in it: plainly it is our duty to do so until we can see our way clearly to something better. So far the Christian stands precisely in the same position as every citizen. There is nothing in his religion to prohibit acquiescence in the existing *régime*. Acquiescence in evil is the condition of life in society, for the sufficient reason that society is made up of individuals, of whom few are wise, and none are wholly good. The problem of duty is largely concerned with the measure and the manner of this indispensable acquiescence. It is as old as Christianity, and will accompany Christianity as long as the world lasts.

'Let both grow together until the harvest,' said the householder in the parable of the tares. St. Paul told the Corinthians that social intercourse with evil livers was unavoidable. To refuse it was equivalent to self-exile from society. 'Then must 'ye needs go out of the world.' The whole history of the Church in the world is a history of acquiescence in political and social conditions which violate Christian principles. If it be urged that the Report is concerned not with the individual Christian, but with 'a Christian community,' we must answer that 'a 'Christian community' must be a community of Christians, and cannot rightly proceed on any principles other than those which determine their procedure.

The Report diagnoses the problem of poverty as 'a problem 'not merely of the amount of wealth produced, but of the pro- 'portions in which it is distributed,' and it is plain that the latter is looked upon as far the most important.

'Is there not some grave error of distribution when the normal lot of many hundred thousand families of independent and industrious citizens, the men who have saved England in the field and the factory, the men who indeed *are* England, is one of constant poverty in spite of constant labour?'

On the false assumption that faulty distribution is the principal root of poverty, the Report moves naturally enough

to a frank endorsement of the Socialist indictment of industrialism as founded on a wrong principle, and boldly claims from Christians, as such, a whole-hearted acceptance of the 'Labour' programme.

'In the first place, then, the whole body of economic tradition and practice which permits industry to repose upon a human foundation of workers who are underpaid, overworked, or casually employed, the whole conception of society which tolerates as normal and inevitable the co-existence of riches and widespread poverty, instead of regarding it as the shameful denial of Christian brotherhood which it is, must be renounced by Christians and abandoned by the community. We think that it is the duty of the nation to take without delay such steps as may be necessary in order to secure a full living wage and reasonable hours of labour to all workers in industry, and that it is the duty of Christian men and women to press for the establishment of such conditions by all means in their power. By a living wage we mean not merely a wage which is sufficient for physical existence, but a wage adequate to maintain the worker, his wife and family, in health and honour, and to enable him to dispense with the subsidiary earnings of his children up to the age of sixteen years. By reasonable hours we mean hours sufficiently short, not merely to leave him unexhausted, but to allow him sufficient leisure and energy for home life, for recreation, for the development through study of his mind and spirit, and for participation in the affairs of the community.'

Again :—

'If workers are indispensable for industry when it is active, it is, in our opinion, right that they should be adequately maintained when industry is slack. We submit that it is the evident duty of Christians to press upon the community, *first*, the adoption of such measures as are likely to diminish unemployment; and, *second*, the provision of adequate and honourable means of maintenance for all workers, who, in spite of such preventive measures, may be from time to time unemployed.'

The 'free labourer' is to be abolished in the interest of 'the 'principle of association.'

'Experience suggests, we think, that unrestricted competition among workers, and among employers, tends to result in social degradation, and that trade associations including all workers, both men and women, on the one hand, and similar associations including all employers on the other, are the best foundation of mutual understanding, industrial peace, and social progress.'

The profits of industry, thus organised on a quasi-caste system, are to be divided on an 'undisputed' Christian principle, which is thus stated.

'It is, that there is no moral justification for profits which exceed the amount needed to pay for adequate salaries to the management, a fair rate of interest on the capital invested, and such reserves as are needed to ensure and maintain the highest efficiency of production and the development and growth of the industry.'

'Christians are bound to discountenance, by every means in their power, the application of wealth to luxuries, to expensive amusements, and to the gratification of wasteful habits, whatever the class in which it may take place. They are bound to insist that, since industry is a public function, no persons are entitled to an income for which no service is rendered, and that it is the duty of those engaged in it to offer the community the best service technically possible at the lowest price compatible with adequate payment to those who provide it, and with the growth and extension of the industry itself.

'It is the duty of Christians to urge that after the necessary charges upon industry, mentioned above, have been met, any surplus should be applied to the benefit of the whole community, and to bear gladly such demands as the community may make upon them for that purpose.'

A section of the Report deals with the task of the parish priest, who is 'to take the lead in the application of the Christian 'faith to social and industrial practice.' Equipped with the Report, he is to 'take his place in the long line which began with 'Amos and Isaiah,' and with the like authority summon his contemporaries to the regeneration of society. How some of the clergy are likely to interpret their prophetic duty is significantly disclosed in the publications of the Church Socialist League, whose members, as we have said, received the Report with warm approval and a very natural exultation. They hailed it as a deliberate endorsement, set forward with the commendation of the Primate himself, of the indictment which they prefer against society, and as the formal enunciation of the principles which socialism logically expresses in practice. It is interesting to note that Mr. George Lansbury, one of the authors of the Report, was, until recently, Chairman of the London branch of the League.

In the publications of the 'Church Socialist League' the distinctive notes of the 'Archbishops' Committee's Report' are all present, though the moderating language of the semi-official document is everywhere lacking. There is the same exaggeration of existing ills: the same over-estimate of possible reforms: the same contempt for political economy: the same insistence upon a dramatic new departure: the same emphatic denunciation of the Church's 'failure.' In spite of much crude sacramentalism,

the general character of this version of Christianity is nakedly secularist. The kingdom of God, which is to be inaugurated by the 'class-war,' is 'of the earth, earthy.' Both in this literature, and in the Report, there is a strange absence of any understanding of the reasons why serious and sympathetic Christian men are quite unable to endorse the view of the Christian's civic duty, which is advanced as if it were self-evident. The silences are not less significant than the assertions, and perhaps even further removed from what Christianity and good citizenship might seem to require. For on any showing, however difficult it may be to trace the lines of Christian obligation in the tangled business of politics, there is no obscurity about the Christian's personal duty in social intercourse. To speak the truth, to be honest and honourable, to respect another's rights, to 'fear God 'and honour the King,' to fulfil the task of one's place in the world sincerely 'as to the Lord and not to men'—these are the elements of Christian living: and they are all difficult to harmonise with the recent practice of organised 'Labour.' Where has there been any effective remonstrance against breach of faith, bad work, coercion of non-unionists, and sabotage from the exponents of 'Christian' or 'Catholic' socialism? It would seem that the 'proletariat' will be as ill served by its chaplains in the future as were the kings, peers, and tradesmen by theirs in the past.

The 'Church Socialist League' is, we understand, as yet but a small society, but it would seem to have the promise of the future, if the 'Report' which the Archbishops' Committee has issued represents the direction in which Anglican thought is moving. A special interest, therefore, attaches to its programme. We notice that the Catholic Socialists are very insistent that their socialism is socialism in the full sense of the term. The familiar language of religion is forced to take a new meaning. A few sentences, from a pamphlet of the 'Catholic Socialist League,' will suffice:—

'To become a Socialist needs a fundamental change of heart and head, of soul and mind. It means the alteration of all one's lines of perspective. It is like nothing so much as the religious act of conversion or self surrender—this tremendous change *is* a religious act; it is conversion.'

'It is conversion to catholicism, for the "idea" of catholicism in its manward and social aspect and the "idea" of socialism are not similar

to one another, or compatible with one another, *but one and the same thing*. Anything short of socialism, we contend, is contrary to the Catholic religion, because anything short of it tends to exploit the weak in the interests of the strong. Our first duty, then, is to condemn, curse, and denounce the spirit of anti-Christ which we find incarnated in the present social order, and the existing economic system. A non-Christian might prefer to say "criticise," but a Christian must go further. He has the prophets and the Christ as his exemplars, and he must follow in their steps.'

The Rev. N. E. Egerton Swann writes in the same vein :—

'There is obviously between "Capital" and "Labour" a direct antagonism of interest, fundamental, unbridgeable, unending, so long as the system lasts. . . . Except one looks steadily at every public question—economic, political, social—in the light of this truth of the "class-war," one cannot (in a Socialist sense) be saved. It is idle to say that Capital is the necessary handmaid of Labour, and they must work together harmoniously.'

The wage-earners are pictured as the victims of the cruellest oppression, living in a 'darkness that may be felt.' It is difficult to understand the bitterness which marks the language of these clergymen until one understands their obsession by a particular view of existing society, a view which is almost fantastic in its remoteness from the facts, but which is none the less gloomy and inflaming almost beyond endurance. Mr. Swann describes the present situation thus :—

'Broadly speaking, the only people who really count are the possessing classes. They are *the* people ; for all practical purposes they stand for the nation, when we are considering the significance and value of the nation in the life of the world as a whole. All culture and refinement, and all that makes up the real life of a nation is, except for a few wretched crumbs that fall from the rich man's table, practically monopolised by the ridiculous little minority floating on the top. The whole significance of the proletariat, the only reason why, as things are, they come into the world at all, is to keep going the life of the possessing class. They really do not count for something in the world in their own right—at any rate, not to anything like an equal extent with the possessing class. The possessing class do, in fact, assume it as inherent in the very nature of things that the proletariat shall, from generation to generation, be at hand to serve as hewers of wood and drawers of water for the favoured few. Nearly all the support given to social reform by the well-to-do is by way of treating the workers *humanely*, just as they treat their domestic animals humanely. But they have not (with very few exceptions) the slightest intention of treating them, in the full sense, *humanly* ; they do not really regard them as equally human beings with themselves. . . . It is not "correct" for the

proletarian to bear himself like a free man. . . . Personal service organisations, children's care committees to deal with crises of unemployment, or with notorious slums, committees for vigilance work of any kind—all these are often wholly, and nearly always chiefly composed of "eminently respectable" people. . . . And the chief business of such organisations is to manage the poor in all kinds of ways. . . . Lastly, the member of one of the humbler classes is stamped as an inferior being by the practically absolute impossibility of marrying anyone of more exalted social rank. The possibility of intermarriage is the crucial test of equality of consideration; its absence sets a stamp of servility and pariahship on the proscribed caste.'

Now the author of this rhodomontade is not only an Anglican clergyman but a double first class Oxford man. Moreover, he does not stand alone. He is one of a considerable and increasing number of Christian ministers of all denominations, except perhaps the Roman Church, who are pouring forth the crudest economic heresies and the harshest dogmas of the class-war from pulpits and platforms, in newspapers and parish magazines, in tracts and catechisms, even in litanies and hymns. All the methods of religion are being freely employed to create a sense of intolerable oppression, and stimulate a passion of class hatred. Congregations are set to sing such words as these:—

'Over your face a web of lies is woven,
Laws that are falsehoods put you to the ground;
Labour is mocked, its just reward is stolen,
On its bent back sits idleness encrowned.
How long, while you sleep,
Your harvest, shall it reap?
Arise, O England, for the day is here!'

Prayers and devotions for use in Advent and Lent and on numerous special occasions breathe the same spirit. A fantastic exegesis has been worked out, and popularised in tracts, with the object of transforming the New Testament into a Socialist manual. Christ, says one writer, 'even encouraged His disciples 'in what might be represented as a certain disregard for the 'sacred rights of property by plucking ears of corn in someone 'else's field in order to satisfy their hunger.' Socialists are churchmen, explains the Hon. and Rev. Canon Adderley, 'because the Church's Bible is on their side from beginning to 'end.' Churchmen are Socialists, he says, 'because they believe 'the present system of capitalism, by which a small, rich class, 'owning the means of production, keeps the vast majority of the

'nation in practical bondage, dictating the terms on which the 'workers shall produce the wealth, and pocketing the profits, is 'injustice, and therefore contrary to the will of God.'

Such language, in varying measures of unreason and violence, is becoming common, and it is easy to believe that it can command a welcome in quarters where the older Christian insistence on personal repentance and reformation is ill regarded. The grave matter is that, at a juncture in our national history, which calls urgently for balance of mind, for caution of policy, and above all for steady work, the Christian Church should be allying itself with the very tendencies which make for class prejudice, for recklessness, and for disgust of labour. Grotesque and even shocking as the language of the Church Socialist League publications is, we cannot fairly deny that its underlying assumptions are hard to differentiate from those which have found more cautious and becoming expression in the Report of the Archbishops' Committee on Christianity and Industrial Problems. In a remarkably able sermon, recently preached before the University of Cambridge, the Regius Professor of Divinity in the sister University, Dr. Headlam, has subjected this Report to a stern and searching criticism. His verdict appears to be as just as it is certainly severe :—

'The Report, as a whole, attacks with little restraint the system of private enterprise on which our modern industrial life is built up. It would commit us as Christians to economic doctrines which are likely, in the opinion of many sound thinkers, to produce widespread misery. It lays down such debatable propositions, surely far exceeding its functions and of very doubtful justice, as that certain classes of land should be heavily rated. It recommends an interference, which to many would seem excessive, in the conditions of labour. It would commit us to accept a national industrial Parliament; in fact, it would have us believe that State socialism is an integral element of Christian teaching.

'I cannot conceal from myself the conviction that this is one of the most harmful documents which has been issued in the name of Christianity, since the days, perhaps, when the Stuart divines taught the doctrine of the divine right of kings, nor have I read any responsible treatise which in my judgment has failed so decisively to grasp the functions of the Christian teacher.'

In a tract, entitled 'Is Socialism Atheism?' Canon Adderley sets himself the task of disproving a proposition which the majority, both of Christians and of Socialists, agree in holding

to be substantially true. He quotes as part of his argument a private letter addressed to himself, in which Mr. Blatchford explained that Socialism was his religion, as Christianity was Canon Adderley's. 'This,' observes the latter, 'is a very different 'thing from saying, You cannot be a Socialist if you are a 'Christian.' Are we to understand, then, that Christians like the ancient eclectics can profess more than one religion? 'Socialism,' says Mr. Ramsay Macdonald, 'has no more to do 'with a man's religion than it has to do with the colour of his 'hair. Socialism deals with secular things, not with ultimate 'beliefs.' But what if the 'ultimate beliefs' of Christianity require a manner of dealing with secular things which disallows the procedure of the Socialists?

Socialism, it appears, has two aspects. It is an economic programme; and it is a religion. Are these inseparable? Is the religion the theory, of which the economic programme is the true and necessary expression? Can the economic programme stand without the religion? Can it harmonise itself with another religion? The answer to these questions must determine finally the relation of Christianity to socialism, for while Christianity can consist with many, perhaps with all, economic programmes, it can admit no rival religion. It is as relevant to the case of 'Labour' as of 'Capital' that men 'cannot serve God and mammon.' Such phrases as 'Christian 'socialism' and 'Catholic socialism' must, at least, be supposed to imply the possibility of separating the economic programme from the religious doctrine of the Socialists. In most cases probably they are used with no very clear notion of either.

It is admittedly the case that the most conspicuous exponents of socialism incline to the view that Christianity and socialism are essentially opposed. In his famous Encyclical Letter on 'the Condition of Labour' (1891), Pope Leo XIII. gave expression to this belief from the side of Christianity. The Pontiff's words do certainly command assent far beyond the wide limits of his own communion. After describing 'the 'misery and wretchedness which press so heavily at this moment 'on the large majority of the very poor,' the letter proceeds:—

'To remedy these evils, the Socialists, working on the poor man's envy of the rich, endeavour to destroy private property, and maintain that individual possessions should become the common property

of all, to be administered by the State or by municipal bodies. They hold that, by thus transferring property from private persons to the community, the present evil state of things will be set to rights, because each citizen will then have his equal share of whatever there is to enjoy. But their proposals are so clearly futile for all practical purposes that, if they were carried out, the working man himself would be among the first to suffer. Moreover, they are emphatically unjust, because they would rob the lawful possessor, bring the State into a sphere that is not its own, and cause complete confusion in the community.'

The Continental Socialists would hardly quarrel with this account of their aims and methods. The more muddled thinkers of this country shrink from such relentless lucidity, and prefer the pleasant half light of altruistic sentimentalism, in which the worst motives can pass for the best, and even a sordid materialism take the shape of Christian faith. There is, indeed, a considerable debatable land in which Christians and Socialists approach one another with some appearance of agreement. At least on one side, there is a strong desire to avoid hostilities, and on the other there is, as yet, no very violent repugnance to peace. Many sincere Christians are professed Socialists, and they easily credit others with the religious convictions which determine their own conduct.

It may, however, be doubted whether an open conflict can much longer be avoided, for the war has given a notable impetus to all the tendencies which find in socialism their natural expression, and at the same time has enfeebled and discredited all forms of organised Christianity. The Churches, conscious of their weakness, and abashed by their apparent failure, are seeking more eagerly than ever for some *modus vivendi* with this formidable power which is replacing them in the allegiance of the masses, openly aiming at a complete dominance, and advancing with a disciplined energy which seems to portend an early triumph. Canon Green, of Manchester, after drawing an alarmist picture of the alienation and hostility of 'the great 'mass of the people,' declares that 'the only possible line of 'safety is in the complete democratisation of the Church.' Might not the proposition, perhaps, be better phrased in the tempter's words to the Founder of Christianity as he unrolled before Him a transporting vision of terrestrial success, 'All 'these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship

'me'? In truth, the unselfishness of their own motives is blinding many excellent clergymen to the essential character of the policy they advocate. They would emulate the charitable complaisance of the great Apostle, who could say of many converts, that 'being crafty he caught them with guile,' and by the surrender of many prejudices, and the adroit concealment of many truths, purchase an entry into the popular confidence. But excellence of motive will not avert disaster to religion and morality if, in the interest of immediate popularity, there be made a surrender of fundamental Christian principle. Nor can the noblest schemes of social 'reconstruction' avoid shipwreck if they do violence to economic science.

The primary concern of Christianity is individual character. If that be sound, the external conditions of life in the world will ultimately right themselves. 'Seek ye first the kingdom 'of God and His righteousness, and all these things shall be 'added unto you.' This is the method of Christ: this is the reason why a 'kingdom of God' is conceivable even on earth, and yet can never be limited to any earthly version. This method of working from within is very repulsive to the impatience of reformers, who would find the source of the ills they wish to eradicate, not in the corrupt heart of man, where their drastic action cannot reach them, but in the circumstances of life which they may transform in a day. But, though repulsive, the method succeeds. 'Wisdom is justified of all 'her children.' Just in so far as men are appropriating the higher motives of effort, setting up the kingdom in their own hearts, can the reformation of society be effected. So far, and no further.

In the economic sphere the same truth holds, and nowhere has it more evident authentications in experience. As the level of industrial efficiency rises, the organisation of industry must, and in a free democracy surely will, reflect the fact. In this respect political development provides a suggestive parallel to economic. Power has been extended ever more widely as political competence has disclosed itself over widening areas of the national life, until we have reached a stage in which it were hardly an exaggeration to say, that citizenship, in the full sense of the term, attaches to the adult life of both sexes. Efficiency always in theory, and largely in fact, has been secured

before power has been conceded. The ruinous consequences of reversing this order are now tragically manifest in Russia, where power, suddenly conferred upon illiterate and politically immature masses, has become the facile tool of an appalling tyranny. Similarly in economics.

Efficiency must precede power. The great improvement in the workers ought to find expression in the system under which they work. That is a process equally natural and congruous with the principles of sound economy. There are no limits to self-government in industry, provided that the laws of economic science be not broken. Dr. Alfred Marshall, whose right to speak in the name of economic science none will dispute, has just published a summary of the conclusions to which a lifetime dedicated to economic studies has led him. They include a frank recognition of the new possibilities which improved efficiency is opening.

'Now, when old age indicates that my time for thought and speech is nearly ended, I see on all sides marvellous developments of working class faculty: and, partly in consequence, a broader and firmer foundation for socialistic schemes than existed when Mill wrote. But no socialistic scheme yet advanced seems to make adequate provision for the maintenance of high enterprise and individual strength of character; nor to promise a sufficiently rapid increase in the business plant and other material implements of production, to enable the real incomes of the manual labour classes to continue to increase as fast as they have done in the recent past, even if the total income of the country be shared equally by all. The average level of human nature in the Western world has risen fast during the last fifty years. But it has seemed to me that those have made most real progress towards the distant goal of ideally perfect social organisation, who have concentrated their energies on some particular difficulties in the way, and not spent strength on endeavouring to rush past them.' (*v.* 'Industry and Trade,' p. 7.)

The veteran economist does but echo, with a particular reference, the words of St. Paul, 'Set not your mind on high 'things, but condescend to things that are lowly.' To make the largeness and generosity of their reforming schemes an excuse for ignoring local and personal rights is the distinctive procedure of revolutionaries. It is the habit of Socialists. 'Hypocrisy,' said Burke, 'of course, delights in the most sublime speculation, 'for never intending to go beyond speculation, it costs nothing 'to have it magnificent.' We are becoming familiar with an

impersonal hypocrisy which attaches to our policies rather than to ourselves, and is the harder to detect, since there is no personal conscience which may act as a detective.

What is the moral worth of an 'equality,' which is to be gained at the price of all that gives value to independence, and salt to life? In their ardour to revolutionise the state of society, for the better as they think, the Socialists of every description are employing weapons of coercion which strike at human character itself, and are almost visibly degrading it.

What economic hardship can compare in moral injury with the silent ubiquitous terrorism which lies behind the successful organisation of a 'lightning strike'? Which inflicts the deeper wound on the self-respect of the individual—a reduction of wage, or a compulsion to break faith with an employer? Which injures the quality of citizenship most—an extension of hours, or 'direct action' against the State? Which conflicts most sharply with 'the royal law' of the Gospel—unemployment or sabotage? The Achilles heel of the 'Labour' movement is its contempt for personal rights and claims. Socialism falls foul of human nature itself.

Respect for personal rights and claims is the very essence of Christian morality. The royal law, according to the Scriptures, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself,' is the very charter of human liberty, because it enshrines the principle of social justice. It is no demand for an unnatural altruism. We are not bidden

> 'To wind ourselves too high,
> For sinful man beneath the sky.'

But our legitimate self-regard is commissioned to be the standing exponent of our neighbour's claim. 'So far as the 'Christian spirit goes,' says Professor Rauschenbusch very justly, 'it bows the egoism of the individual to the service of the 'community,' but it does this, not by disallowing the motives and exertions which develop and enrich individual life—that is the root-error of socialism—but by requiring the individual always to hold himself closely to his fellows, and to interpret their claims by his own. Shakespeare, as usual, seizes the main point in the casuistry of social life.

> 'This above all—to thine own self be true;
> And it must follow, as the night the day,
> Thou canst not then be false to any man.'

In deserting its proper concern with personal morality in order to embark on the more exciting business of economic agitation, the Church is withdrawing from the Labour movement precisely that moral assistance which at this juncture it most evidently needs. Nor is this the whole extent of the mischief. By carrying the fervour and dogmatism of religion into the economic sphere, the clergy stimulate in themselves and in others the disposition to belittle experience and despise science. For one person who can think clearly there are a thousand who can feel strongly, and speak vehemently. 'Those who quit 'their proper character to assume what does not belong to them 'are, for the most part, ignorant both of the character they 'leave and of the character they assume.' It is true that the Archbishops' Committee recommend, 'that the preparation of 'the clergy for the ministry should include a training in 'economic and social science,' but it is notorious that for most Ordination candidates any adequate equipment for the task of handling industrial problems directly, and in some sense officially, will be wholly inaccessible. Most of the parish clergy will naturally accept at face value the doctrines, ethical and economic, of a Report which comes to them with the Primate's emphatic recommendation. There, indeed, they are exhorted to 'acquaint themselves by every means in their power with the 'social aims and aspirations of those to whom they minister.' It is excellent advice if, and only if, they have a firm hold on Christian principles, and a just estimate of their own limitations. The literature of the 'Church Socialist League' (which probably represents a vast amount of oral teaching) forbids much confidence that these conditions will be satisfied, and the Archbishops' Committee's Report justifies the apprehension that the natural inclination of the parish clergy to echo the opinions of their parishioners will not be corrected or restrained by the guidance of their official superiors.

It is deeply regrettable that this elaborate Report on the gravest of practical subjects should have been sent broadcast over the country at this juncture, with the most authoritative commendation, before it had been so much as considered by the Bishops and the Convocations, or its economic doctrines submitted to the examination of any recognised experts.

H. H. HEREFORD.

LATIN PROSE FICTION

1. **Petronii Satirae.** Edited by F. BUCCHELER. Berlin. 1871.
2. **The Satyr of Petronius** By M. BURNABY. London. 1694.
3. **The Bibliography of Petronius.** By STEPHEN GASELEE. *Transactions of the Bibliographical Society*, vol. x., pp. 141-223.
4. **Petronius.** With Translation by MICHAEL HESELTINE. Loeb Classical Library. William Heinemann. 1913.

THE word 'novel,' as we understand it to-day, describes a modern development of literature. It is only by a kind of literary anachronism that the term can be applied to the fabulous narratives in Greek prose, which belong, for the most part, to the late Roman or Byzantine Empire.* The prose romances of Greece contain the germs of many of the literary forms into which later fiction has been moulded. They reveal the classical spirit in process of decomposition, and the romantic spirit struggling to rise out of the decaying mass. They give a foretaste, yet always with a difference, of many modern sentiments, and notably of the love of external nature, whether it is the savage grandeur of mountain scenery, or the cultivated beauty of luxuriant gardens. But with novels of to-day they challenge no legitimate comparison, because they never attempt the realistic and dramatic representation of complex character, which is the true spirit of the modern art.

In Latin literature, prose fiction occupies a narrow space. Though earlier in date, it is more modern in form than the Greek romances. Public libraries in Rome contained collections of short stories of the Milesian type, whether of native growth or derived from Greek originals. If librarians had recorded the books most frequently read, these tales would probably be found to have been more in demand than Virgil or Livy. It was with a work of this character that the subaltern crammed his knapsack when he went on foreign service under Crassus against the Parthians. It was a similar kind of literature that Aulus Gellius bought at Brindisi to while away the weariness of his journey to Rome. But in the Latin languages these tales have

* See 'Greek Prose Romances,' EDINBURGH REVIEW, July 1913.

not survived. Speaking generally, Latin prose writers, less directly affected by Oriental influences than the Greeks of Asia Minor or Alexandria, and more absorbed in public life, do not seem to have felt the impulse to compose fictitious narratives. Two books only of this type have survived, and both probably fall within the first two centuries of the Christian era. One is the *Satyricon* of Petronius, the other the *Golden Ass* of the African Apuleius. If small in bulk, the product is great in literary value. Each writer opened up new paths, and hundreds of years passed before these were fully explored. Petronius, a first-century Fielding, abandoned the typical and impersonal for humorous and realistic studies of individuals. Apuleius, a Baudelaire of the second century, used language daringly as a colour-box to produce his supernatural atmosphere and the richness of his pictorial effects. The *Satyricon* and the *Golden Ass* belong, in their very different ways, to a higher literary order than the adventurous pages of Heliodorus, or the studied elegance of *Daphnis and Chloe*.

In spite of Mr Whibley's admirable and spirited protest, it is still customary to apologise for the literary discussion of books which justly enjoy so unsavoury a reputation as the *Satyricon* or the *Golden Ass*. Neither of the Latin writers feels any restraint of decorum. Yet St. Augustine read Apuleius, half believing in the truth of the metamorphosis, and from the pages of Petronius Jeremy Taylor drew an illustration for his 'Holy Dying.' The respectability of such sponsors, at least, vouches for the general interest of the books. For Petronius, indeed, a defence may be urged. He makes it for himself in lines which may be paraphrased thus :—

> 'Catos ! Why stare at me with disapproving frown ?
> Why damn the strangeness of my work's simplicity ?
> In Latin undefiled—what's done by all the town
> I tell, unsoured by gloom, with frank sincerity.'

The *Satyricon* holds up a mirror to a squalid section of Roman society. A picture of the Empire in the days of Nero would be incomplete if the author ignored so conspicuous a feature in social life as the prevalence of immorality, both in its modern and its pagan forms. Petronius accepts vice as a matter of fact, and handles it frankly without a trace of prurience. He presents it stark naked, with a serene unconsciousness which is a stranger to shame. The Council of Trent showed sound

sense in its decision to exclude the *Satyricon* from the list of books which it prohibited because 'res lascivas seu obscenas ex 'professo tractant aut docent.' For Apuleius the same defence cannot be urged. He was writing an imaginary work, and was free to omit the subject altogether. He knew the taste of the reading public too well to abstain. The best that can be pleaded for him is that he has toned down the worst passage in the Greek version of his story.

The *Satyricon* alone is the subject of the present article. If the book had any literary forerunners in Greek or Latin prose, they have perished. It breaks with all tradition. It opens fresh ground. It stands alone in classical literature, one of the most interesting and curious works that have come down to us from antiquity. It may fairly claim to be, in many respects, the first modern novel. Unlike other ancient works of fiction, it is not serious, tragic, impersonal, remote from realities, belonging to no particular age or country. Here are no conventional princesses of divine and irresistible beauty, no flower-crowned shepherdesses masquerading in Arcadian innocence. On the contrary, the book thrusts us into the company of three rascally young Bohemians, plunges us into the tortuous by-streets of the half Greek cities of Southern Italy, forces us into the midst of the squalid realities of the Roman underworld. A keen observer, whom little escapes, Petronius is alive to the comedies as well as the tragedies of life, capable of seeing and understanding both together, and acutely sensitive to the humour of the clash of their contrasts. So far as appears from the fragmentary form in which the book survives, he makes no attempt at a plot. The connecting thread is slender. But apart from the construction of his story, his methods are strikingly modern. His figures, strongly individualised, stand up in firm relief against backgrounds which are never too overloaded to be subservient to their purpose. Yet on occasions he does not hesitate to multiply details, and gives them with vivid precision. More than one of his interiors are Dutch pictures in words. When he is not familiarly colloquial, or deliberately slangy, he is the master of a pure supple style, which has the high finish of simplicity. The coiner of the famous phrase, 'Horatii curiosa felicitas,' and the framer of the sentence, which Landor judged to be the most beautiful 'in all Latinity,' was no ordinary scribbler. Interspersed with his

wildest indecencies and most cynical whimsicalities are passages of fine literary criticism and interludes of verse which often rise to genuine and distinctive poetry.

The date of the *Satyricon* is uncertain, its authorship anonymous; even the title by which it is generally known is probably not its own. It has come down to us in a fragmentary form; four-fifths of the whole are lost, and it was not till the latter half of the seventeenth century that the longest and most continuous fragment was discovered in the obscure Dalmatian town of Trau. All these circumstances, combined with the possible identification of the author with the famous Roman patrician, whose career and death are described by Tacitus, have made the book the battle-ground of critics. Who was this unknown genius who created a new branch of literature? When did he write? With what object? No absolute answers can be given. Manuscripts ascribe the authorship to Petronius Arbiter. But the evidence which thus connects the book with the friend of the Emperor Nero is not conclusive, because the ascription may be the hand of the copyist. Neither does the title of the book establish the author's intention to lash the vices of the town. Whether *Satyricon* or *Satirae* is accepted as the title—and the best modern editor adopts the latter—the word probably means, not a satire, but a miscellany, or hotch-potch of prose and verse.

In the midst of so much uncertainty, conjecture is free. Novelists claim greater license than critics. Farrer in 'Darkness and Dawn,' Sienkievicz in 'Quo Vadis,' assume that Nero's favourite was the author of the *Satyricon*. It must always remain a mystery, why, if the historical Petronius wrote so famous a book, Tacitus did not mention the fact. Be this as it may, the majority of scholars identify the anonymous author with the Petronius described in the *Annals* as the 'arbiter elegantiæ,' whose word was final with Nero on matters of taste, and who was first the friend, then the victim of the Emperor. In the *Satyricon* the author rigorously suppressed himself; but the few glimpses that are revealed of his elusive personality are consistent with the portrait painted by Tacitus. Internal evidence, though itself inconclusive, suggests the probable date of the book to be between 60 A.D. and 65 A.D., and so confirms the identification. The gain in historical interest is great, if the brilliant patrician is accepted as the author of the *Satyricon*.

No probabilities are violated by the theory, while many are satisfied. We may therefore imagine the book to have been composed and read aloud by Petronius for the amusement of himself and the Imperial Court.

Tacitus tells us that Petronius turned night into day, and owed his reputation less to his energy than to his indolence. His contemporaries never confounded him with ordinary spendthrifts who waste their fortunes in vulgar debaucheries. They always regarded him as a supreme artist in all the refinements of luxury. The graceful air of unaffected naturalness, which characterised his wildest and most whimsical sayings and doings, caught the taste of the town. Yet the man had in him higher qualities. In public life, both as pro-consul and as consul, he distinguished himself by his vigour and administrative capacity. His work done, he returned to his former mode of life, though whether the viciousness of his habits was a reality or an affectation, Tacitus is uncertain. Chosen by Nero as one of his few intimate friends, he became the Emperor's supreme guide in matters of taste. Nero saw no charm in luxury except through the eyes of Petronius. His superiority in all the science of pleasure provoked the jealousy of Tigellinus. Working on the Emperor's dominant passions of suspicion and cruelty, he accused Petronius of complicity in a treasonable plot. A slave was bribed to inform against him: the greater part of his household were thrown into prison; he was deprived of all means of defence. At the moment Nero was on his way to Campania. Petronius followed the Court as far as Cumæ. There he was detained. To linger in suspense between hope and fear was not to his taste. He determined to take his life, but to give his enforced death the appearance of a gradual and natural end. He cut the arteries in his arms, bound them up again, and reopened them, as the humour seized him. Meanwhile he dined, slept, and conversed with his friends, not on serious topics like the immortality of the soul, but on light poetry and gay verse. Many victims had flattered Nero or Tigellinus in their wills. Not so Petronius. He drew up an account of the Emperor's monstrous debaucheries, with the names of his male and female companions, and sent it to Nero, sealed with his own seal. Then he broke his signet ring, so that it might not be used to endanger the lives or fortunes of his friends. The manner in which the witty and brilliant patrician quitted life appealed

strongly to the cultured aristocratic Frenchmen of the seventeenth century. St. Evrémond considered his death to be the finest recorded in antiquity. He died, not with a Stoic's ostentation of austere fortitude, but with the gay indifference which Epicureans often affected, but at such moments rarely commanded.

The denunciation of Nero, to which Petronius devoted his last hours, may suggest some previous practice in literary composition. To this extent it confirms the theory which identifies him with the author of the *Satyricon*. But earlier critics carried the point further. Though they recognised that the *Satyricon* was too elaborate a work to be the indictment itself, they imagined it to be written in the same vein. They regarded it as a *roman au clé*, in which the actors personated well-known characters at Court, and in which the author scourged the vices of Nero and his friends. The satirist of an Emperor jeopardised his life. A man who, in the cause of morality, faced this danger, must not only possess high courage; he must also be fired to no ordinary degree by moral earnestness. Men of this type seldom count the cost; they rarely are at pains to conceal the object of their attack. Yet the champions of the *roman au clé* never agreed on the character which represented Nero. The theory is untenable. Indeed, the gaiety and humour of the *Satyricon* protest against its being regarded as a satire at all. To call Petronius a satirist is to rob him of some of the most characteristic gifts which link him with the moderns and distinguish him among both his predecessors and successors in the prose fiction of Greece and Rome.

In the *Satyricon* there is no trace of the high scorn, the passionate indignation, the moral fervour of the satirist. Petronius is at once too accurate an observer, too artistic and too humorous to play the part. He sees both sides of human nature represented in each individual; he detects a vein of gold, however thin, running through the basest ore. He has not the one-sided concentration of vision which enables the satirist to see and use only one colour, and that the blackest. He knows the artistic value of gradations of light and shade. His most disreputable or broadly comic characters show flashes of higher feeling. Encolpus, ripe for any rascality, is a scholar and an educational enthusiast; Eumolpus passes from disgusting confessions to poetry and sound criticism; the contemptible and

wheedling Giton has the grace to maintain the laws of hospitality; Trimalchio himself is not the monster of the satirist, but a many-sided living man. It is in the rapid play of contrasts between the two sides of human nature, in the sudden clash of opposing motives or sentiments, in the abrupt transitions from grave to gay, or from high to low, that Petronius finds the fount and inspiration of his humour. On these lines he etches his figures and handles his situations. Over the whole plays his peculiar irony—the tragic echo which accompanies and mocks the most boisterous comedy. Aristocrat to the finger-tips, he never pities or sympathises with his actors. They are not of his world or surroundings. His irony has in it almost a touch of condescension. Rarely bitter, seldom playful, it is light, tolerant, bantering, the amused tone of the disillusioned man of the world, of letters, affairs, and pleasure. It strikes the note which ripe experience, with every advantage of birth and education, might sound towards those whose opportunities have been fewer and horizons more limited.

The *Satyricon*, then, is not a satire; it is rather a humorous commentary on human life. It contains much that would gratify, little that could displease, the Emperor Nero. Of the Court, or the fashionable world, nothing is said. On politics it is equally silent; they were in the danger zone. It does not allude to the Constitution: the forum is only mentioned as the midnight market for stolen goods: no emperors would resent the gibe at the Senate, which they alternately cajoled and threatened. The theatre is discreetly omitted; Petronius, as a man of independent mind, could not, without gross flattery, approve the degradation of the imperial dignity by Nero's appearances on the stage. On the other hand, the literary criticism of Lucan's poetical innovations in the *Pharsalia* was calculated to please the Emperor, who prided himself on his mythological learning. So, too, the elaborate portrait of the millionaire freedman, Trimalchio, could only have been welcome to Nero, who was proud of his birth, detested the memory of the Emperor Claudius who had encouraged the freedman class, and dreaded its rapid rise to wealth and influence. Nor can the other ingredients of the book have been less to the Emperor's taste. The desire for knowledge of life among all classes drove Nero to roam the streets in midnight masquerade. In the *Satyricon* he found some of the materials that he sought,

observed with photographic fidelity, and presented with dramatic power and humorous gaiety.

The contents of the *Satyricon* show no trace of any intention to satirise Nero. It is a *roman des moeurs*, the scenes of which are laid among the freedmen, traders, and small officials of a provincial city like Naples. With many tantalising gaps, historians have reconstructed for us the world of official and fashionable Rome under the Empire. The value of the *Satyricon* is that it reveals something of the minds, prepossessions, and ordinary conversation of a different section of the community. Making due allowance for literary license, the most striking effect of the picture is the impression which it produces of moral decadence. To discover in the *Satyricon* a serious purpose may be to break the charm of irresponsible gaiety which pervades this wayward and whimsical work. It is also dangerous with an author, whose personality is so carefully concealed, to distinguish between his own opinions and those which he attributes to his actors speaking in character. But, after his own whimsical fashion, Petronius gravely discusses two social features which contributed not a little to the decay of public and private morality. One is the vicious artificiality of Roman education, the other is its consequence—the hollowness and unreality of mental life.

Like Rabelais, Petronius seems to be in earnest on the subject of education. Characteristically enough, he chooses as a spokesman one of the three beggar-students, whose adventures are the peg on which the story hangs. Encolpius, who is throughout the narrator, is an ancestor of Gil Blas, but with a more definite character of his own. Still quite young, he has crowded into his short and wandering life unnumbered rascalities. Well born, well educated, without a scruple or a penny, he is, when the story opens, a wanderer, 'wanted' in every town, shivering at any contact with the majesty of the law. Bold to plan, ingenious to execute, he is physically a coward. But his gaiety is imperturbable. He takes his beatings with a shrug and a tag from the classics, and sets himself to devise some new shift by which he can cadge a meal. This young rascal, the rhetorician, Agamemnon, and the poet, Eumolpus, are the mouthpieces of Petronius's views on education and mental life.

Rhetoric was still the chief avenue to power at Rome. As such it was the coping stone of the educational system. Encolpius has just listened to a declamation by Agamemnon.

Taking him aside he preaches to him the gospel of Carlyle. Everything is words—words, cant—cant. Schools of rhetoric succeed only in one thing; they turn out fools. Boys are trained in exercises so remote from real life that when they appear in public they are like stuck pigs. Eloquence has no substance; it is merely a jingle of empty phrases. As with oratory, so with philosophy, logic, astronomy, and above all, literature. None is real; their life is strangled by a bastard Hellenism. Agamemnon admits the charge against the schools of rhetoric. But teachers must live. Fishermen might as well expect to catch fish with a naked hook as a master to get pupils if he teaches what parents do not want. It is parents who are to blame. They refuse to have their children brought up under discipline. All they demand is that they should make a noise in the world by public speaking before they have thrown away their feeding bottles. As boys they trifle away their time at school; as young men they make themselves ridiculous in public life. Entirely without intellectual or moral enthusiasm, Agamemnon acts up to his own sordid view of his art. To him teaching means only a livelihood, a method of securing an invitation to the rich man's table. Private tutors are as bad as public schools. Parents were careless of the moral characters of men to whom they entrusted their sons. The conduct of Eumolpus towards his pupil has its parallel in true history.

The artificiality of Roman education reacted on literature, especially on poetry, which in the schools was the chief exercise of youthful brains. Budding poets were stimulated to the same precocity as infant orators. Both advertised their wares by public recitations—if rich, in hired houses, if poor, in public places. The effect on both was disastrous. Public attention was most easily caught by novelty of phrase, eccentricity of expression, or epigrammatic smartness. To these oratorical or literary devices were sacrificed the things that mattered—substance of thought, reality, natural feeling. Ragged and hungry, the poet Eumolpus adds another cause for the decay of the arts and sciences. It is the exclusive pursuit of wealth. 'Why,' he asks, 'has painting sunk so low?' He answers in the spirit of one of Ruskin's Oxford Lectures. It is because 'in all eyes, whether of gods or men, a lump of 'gold is a thing of greater beauty than all the works of those 'crazy Greeks, Apelles and Phidias.'

Into the scale of unreality was thrown the influence of the Stoics. Their philosophy contained some of the strongest elements which made for the regeneration of society, but it had lost touch with humanity. Its tendency was to regard men and women as abstractions, dominated by pure Reason. In its contempt for the passions, it neglected the natural sources of human conduct and action. Against this mental attitude Petronius revolts. He and the Stoics stand poles asunder. Whatever are the faults of the *Satyricon*, it is neither artificial nor unreal. It throbs with vitality: it has too much, rather than too little, flesh and blood. In effect its realistic methods of treatment seem to say to a hollow artificial age:—Get back to the elemental truths of life, and you recover its reality and substance. Study human nature at your doors, and you cease to be imitative and artificial. Learn that Romans are not impersonal types dominated by pure reason, but creatures compounded of good and evil, governed by natural impulses and desires, and you will find the materials of a sane education and a native art and literature.

His well-known criticism of Lucan's *Pharsalia* appears, at first sight, to contradict this view of Petronius. Lucan, still almost an infant prodigy, had produced the first three books of his epic poem on the struggle between Cæsar and Pompey. He determined to rely on the true facts of history, and to discard the superannuated machinery of Greek mythology. With this innovation Petronius might be expected to sympathise. But through the mouth of the poet, Eumolpus, he champions the extreme artificialities of the older school against Lucan's attempt at more realistic methods.

Eumolpus is brought on the scene in a serio-comic manner, and preserves the character throughout. A shameless reprobate, he is refined and cultured by his artistic and literary tastes. In his description, two points should be specially noted—his name and his age. In mythology Eumolpus is the son of Poseidon; his name warns us to expect a champion of Olympus. He is an old man. No one likes to think, still less to confess, that his life's work has been on the wrong lines. It is the tradition of his youth that he is defending, when he advocates the ultra-classical school of poetry. The occasion on which he delivers his criticism is broadly comic. He is on his way to Crotona, a city of legacy-hunters, a city like a field

in plague time, full only of mangled corpses and the crows that mangle them. He intends to pose as a childless African millionaire, to play the part of the carcass and prey upon the crows. His two companions have sworn implicit obedience. It is to them, an audience submissive as slaves, that he addresses his criticism and its illustration. He urges that Poetry is a high calling which demands an arduous apprenticeship. To succeed, a poet must be steeped in the great stream of literature. He must command a definite poetic vocabulary like that of Virgil and Horace. He must weave his threads into a harmoniously coloured texture, and not leave it a staring fabric of gaudy patches of rhetoric. Recent military events are not appropriate to epic poetry ; they are history, and better told by historians. Therefore, the poet who makes the attempt is foredoomed to failure, unless he is saturated through and through with great literature. So far Eumolpus is on sound lines. He hits real blots in the *Pharsalia*. But he goes further, and champions the extreme views of classical conservatives. The poet, he says, who essays a historical epic on recent military events must rid himself of facts, use every artifice of his craft, employ divine intervention and legendary lore, and allow himself to be swept impetuously towards his goal by the full tide of his inspiration. Only thus will his work resemble the fine madness of the poet. On these lines he proceeds, as it were, to rewrite the *Pharsalia* in his poem on ' The Civil War.'

The question is, whether the latter part of this criticism and its illustration express the serious opinions of Petronius or the views of the aged poet speaking in character. If the latter, then the poem is a parody designed to reduce to an absurdity the extreme classical theory. Petronius is true to himself, laughing both at revolutionary and reactionary. It is generally held that the poem is serious, and that it proves Petronius to have been a classical conservative. But it is submitted, with some confidence, that this view is incorrect, and that the poem of Eumolpus is a skilful parody. No one imagines that the commonplace verses put into the mouth of Trimalchio are the serious work of Petronius. It is equally possible to suppose that Eumolpus is speaking in no other character than his own. In deciding whether 'The Civil War' is, or is not, a parody, both the literary tendencies of Petronius and his distinctive poetic gifts should be borne in mind. The imitative and artificial methods

of the poem find no parallel in the vivid realism of the prose portions of the *Satyricon*. Neither are they at all reproduced in the minor pieces of poetry in which Petronius undoubtedly speaks for himself. These little compositions reveal, to a striking degree, an artist's delicate sense of form, colour, and finish. Their ease and grace give Petronius a distinct place of his own in Latin poetry. But he holds it by none of the qualities which appear in 'The Civil War.' Apart from the originality and realism of his literary tendencies, it is difficult to imagine that his fastidious taste would have tolerated the flamboyant artificiality of Eumolpus. It seems far more probable that the poem is a parody written to turn into ridicule the theory of the critic, and the school to which he belonged.

The place, however, of the *Satyricon* in the history of prose fiction does not depend on the identity of the anonymous author or on his views of education or poetry. It rests on its humorous, realistic pictures of Roman life in the days of Nero. Here it stands alone in classical fiction. It strikes a new and original note. It makes no appeal to the marvellous; its incidents are possible, if not probable, its methods of treatment surprisingly modern. The feast of Trimalchio may serve as an illustration. It is the longest and most continuous fragment that has survived, and it contains little to which moral objection can be taken.

Encolpius and his two companions are invited to the party by Agamemnon. On their way to the house they see an ugly, bald-headed, elderly man, in a russet tunic, playing at ball with a crowd of lads, but too proud to pick up the balls that he drops. It is their host Trimalchio. They pass through the lodge, where lounges a gorgeous porter, busy shelling peas into a silver bowl. The courtyard is surrounded with frescoes depicting Trimalchio's rise from slave to millionaire. Everywhere there is magnificence—troops of officials, regiments of servants, and, in the dining-room, costly lamps and ponderous plate. Encolpius takes his place at a table. On his left is a frequent guest who knows the house and its inmates. When all the guests are seated, Trimalchio enters, heralded by a flourish of trumpets, and takes the place of honour. The sight of his bald head peeping out of his scarlet mantle, bolstered round with cushions and scarves to keep off the draughts, is almost too much for the gravity of Encolpius. The feast begins, each course

being introduced with some fantastic machinery. The description of the surprises is tiresome; but, as the reality bored Encolpius, the effect may be intentional. The composition of a banquet, which was carefully studied in fashionable Rome, often followed the lines of the stage. At the end of each course, the curtain, as it were, fell, and rose again on a new course in a fresh scene. The point which Petronius means to be ridiculous is not so much the theatrical surprises as their tastelessness or puerility. Another ridiculous feature is the excess of music. The servants sing as they enter or leave the room or perform their services. Encolpius begins to wonder whether the waiters are not a company from a low music hall, instead of the trained servants of a well ordered household.

Trimalchio is cast in the heroic mould. His life is the epic of the self-made man, or, in modern phrase, the profiteer. He tells his guests the story of his rise. Born a slave, he came out of Asia, no bigger than this candlestick. A Ganymede to his master, no Joseph to his mistress, he won their confidence. At their deaths he found himself his master's heir and the owner of a senator's estate. Money begets the need of money. He speculated in ships, and in cargoes of food and wine, which were necessaries and scarce. Once his vessels foundered. His wife, Fortunata, sold her jewels and clothes and brought him the money. There she showed her heart; but, after all, she only gave him a pig from his own sow. He rebuilt his fleet, bought cheap, sold dear, and prospered. Money gathered money like a snowball. He turned his hovel into this magnificent house, with its twenty bedrooms, the apartments for himself and his wife, its two marble porticoes, its gallery above stairs, its four dining-rooms capable of accommodating a thousand guests, its excellent porter's lodge. If a man has a penny in his purse, he is worth a penny. We are all taken at our cash value. And so your friend, who was once a frog, is become a king. It is no wonder that his three household gods, which, together with a statuette of himself, are carried round for the worship of his guests, bear the titles of Business, Luck, and Lucre.

From the first, Trimalchio dominates the conversation. He patronises his guests. At the beginning of the feast, displaying his rings and bracelets, and picking his teeth with a silver tooth-pick, he says, 'I did not intend, gentlemen, to come to table 'myself so early. But rather than keep you waiting, I have

'sacrificed my own convenience.' When his century-old wine is brought round, he pronounces it 'sound Opimian,' and adds, 'I did not put such wine on the table yesterday, though my 'company was much better quality.' 'Be merry,' he urges them elsewhere; 'time was when I was no better than yourselves, 'but by my own industry, I am what I am.' He is ostentatious of his wealth to the point of arrogance. He boasts of his collection of silver plate: but, when a slave drops a silver dish, he orders him to leave it to be swept up with the rubbish. When his wife's ornaments are admired, he sends for the scales to advertise their weight. A boy who accidentally strikes his arm instantly receives his freedom, in order that no man should say that Trimalchio was bruised by a slave. With his servants he is at once harsh and familiar. On one of his estates a slave has been crucified; he threatens to have another burnt alive. On the other hand, he puns on the name of one, nicknames a second, takes a bet with a third. 'After all,' he says, 'slaves 'are men; they have sucked the same milk as ourselves,' and he invites his own to take their places at the tables. However much the sentiment may appeal to the Stoics or to ourselves, Petronius does not intend it as praiseworthy. Roman patricians might tolerate the severity; they would have been outraged by the familiarity.

As the feast proceeds, Trimalchio interprets the bill of fare, so that his guests may know what they eat and drink, acts little comedies with his slaves over the surprises at the banquet, moralises, versifies, strikes out an epigram, and enters it on his note-book as an impromptu. His efforts are received with applause by his guests, and none are noisier than those who have heard it all before, and hope to hear it again. At one stage he gives the talk an intellectual turn. 'We must,' he says, 'use our brains as well as our jaws.' In reality he betrays himself in every sentence; his grammar, his pronunciation, his history are all at fault. A patron of letters, he says that he has two libraries, one of Greek books, the other of Latin; but he calls them 'librairies' (bubliothecas). He has read Homer as a boy, and appeals to Agamemnon whether he also remembers the twelve labours of Hercules and the story of Ulysses. He himself had seen the Cumæan Sybil hanging alive in a bottle, and, when the children asked her, 'What would'st thou?' she answered, 'I would die.' He flounders in his history and

mythology. He places Hannibal, 'a mischievous, crafty fellow,' at the siege of Troy, and confuses Cassandra with Medea. Interested in declamation, he asks Agamemnon what is the theme for the day. 'A poor man and a rich were at enmity,' begins the rhetorician—Trimalchio breaks in with the question, 'What is a poor man?' 'Spoken like a true gentleman,' says Agamemnon, with his eye to another dinner; but before the explanation is complete, it is again cut short with, 'If it is a 'fact, there is no dispute; if it is not a fact, there is nothing 'in it.' He expounds the signs of the Zodiac, and the type of men born under each. 'Under Sagittary are born the squint-'eyed rogues who stare at the cabbage, and steal the bacon; 'under the Fishes those who fill men's bellies and minds—'caterers and rhetoricians.' The guests loudly applaud his exposition, and agree that not even the Astronomer-Royal could show more learning.

Trimalchio's table-talk is often pretentious and ignorant. He is too thick-skinned to suspect that he may be a laughing-stock to the guests whose applause he purchases with a meal. But though his literary affectations are ridiculous, they spring from a natural appreciation of higher things than material enjoyment. With all his follies and vulgarities are blended rough humour and native shrewdness. Though it may tend to his own glorification, his hospitality is genuine. There is tact, as well as kindliness, in the way he stops a quarrel. Some absurdity has set Ascyltos and Giton giggling. Their laughter infuriates an older guest, who gives them the rough side of a very rough tongue. 'Gently, there!' says Trimalchio; 'let us all be 'pleasant, and do you, Hermeros, leave the lad alone. His 'young blood is hot. Play the soberer man. He who with-'draws first from a quarrel withdraws the conqueror.' He tells a story admirably. There is a genuine touch of Gothic horror in his weird tale of the corpse of the beautiful boy, stolen by the night-hags from the house of mourning. He is not entirely deceived by his flatterers. 'No one in the company,' he says, as he throws a roll to his favourite dog, 'loves me like this poor 'beast.' Through all his pride in his wealth runs a curious vein of scoffing irony. His Opimian suggests to him the reflection that 'the life of wine is longer than the life of a paltry 'man.' As he plays with his jointed skeleton of silver, he moralises in verse:—

> 'What a truly contemptible trifle is man—
> Just a bundle of bones at the end of life's span!
> So we all will make merry as long as we can.'

Even in the delight of rehearsing his own funeral, he wonders sombrely whether in death he will enjoy the spikenard as much as he does in life.

Till almost the end of the feast the hostess remains in the background. Trimalchio's attachment to his ugly, scolding wife is to his credit. He is grateful for her help in past struggles, proud of her dancing the 'kli-ki-can.' *His* Fortunata, as he affectionately calls her, is the chief heiress under the will, which he reads aloud with choking voice. Her statue is to adorn the monument that he minutely describes. He loads her with costly clothes and ornaments. But she has not risen with her husband. The ordering of her household is her passion and her life. Her eye is everywhere; nothing escapes. Encolpius had already noticed a woman bustling backwards and forwards. His neighbour tells him that she is Fortunata, the wife of Trimalchio. While the meal is being served, she will not sit down. 'Till she has checked the plate,' says Trimalchio, 'and served out the broken meats to the servants, neither bite 'nor sup will pass her lips.' It is not till an important guest, arriving late, and bringing his wife with him, refuses to sit down without his hostess, that she joins the company. Trimalchio has read his will aloud, and for the thousandth time given his instructions for his mausoleum. Suddenly, with one of those rapid contrasts which Petronius loves, a storm bursts. Fortunata, catching her husband in some act of familiarity with a slave, rails at him as a disgrace to an honest woman. Beside himself with rage, he throws a cup at her head, and follows it up with a torrent of the vilest abuse. As the only punishment adequate to her offence, he orders that her statue is not to be placed on his monument, and that she shall not be suffered to kiss his corpse. At last his friends pacify him. He apologises humbly to the company for his violence. But he does not so readily forgive Fortunata. The storm still rumbles in the distance, and 'bandy-legs,' 'dunghill-scraper,' and 'viper,' are some of his endearments. Finally his vanity culminates in his own funeral. As he lies in state, he bids his trumpeters blow, and his friends prepare to pay him compliments. With so lusty a blast did the trumpets sound, that the night watchmen mistake the noise

for a fire-alarm. They burst into the room, and in the confusion Encolpius and his friends escape from the house and stagger home to their lodging.

Scarcely less vivid than the portrait of Trimalchio are the sketches of some of the guests. For a brief interval, the host retires from the banquet. No sooner is his back turned than a flood of conversation pours across the tables from the humbler company. Encolpius can only report the talk of the nearest group. It is typical of the rest. With the vivacity and gesticulation of the South, each with his particular trick, like the 'D'ye see?' of Encolpius's neighbour, they pour out a stream of proverbs, oaths, repetitions, popular sayings, words racy of the soil, idioms fresh from the mint of the market. The range of subjects and ideas is limited. The guests talk of what they have most at heart. Food and sport—and money, as the means of both—stand first. Other subjects are their neighbours, the weather, suspicion of profiteering by officials and retailers, and the passionate desire, doubly strong in these former slaves, to give their sons a better chance than their fathers. Towards education their attitude is half envious, half contemptuous. They are jealous of the advantages it gives in the race for wealth. They resent the distinctions founded upon it, and the superior airs of scholars. They resent them the more, because in practical life they can give points to the professors. 'Book-learning apart,' says Echion to Agamemnon, 'we know you for a fool.' What he says in a good temper, Hermeros, the mason, says in a rage. He has never studied geometry ; but he knows all that wants knowing about stones and metals, and thanks God for his trade. A vocational training, not a liberal education, is what they want.

The first speaker complains of the cold ; he could not get hot even in the bath. But a good belly-full of wine keeps out more cold than the stoutest broadcloth. Then he confesses that he has drunk his whack, and relapses into incoherence. The next speaker takes up the subject of the bath. He does not hold with too much bathing. Water stews the juices out of a man's blood. He took no bath that day, because he had been to a funeral. Old Chrysanthus is gone. He was a good sort. I was with him only the other day, and seem to be talking to him now. We men are blown out bladders, strutting on two sticks. We are of less account than flies ; they have something in them; we are only bubbles. Anyhow he had a handsome burial. Only,

his wife did not cry as if she would miss him much. Well! and what if he did not treat her very well? Women are vultures. Men are fools to show them kindness; they might as well chuck it down a well. Phileros interrupts with, 'let's talk about the living,' and then proceeds to abuse the dead man. He is one of those who boast of their plain speech. Chrysanthus, he says, got his dues. He had nothing when he started, and to the day of his death would have picked a farthing out of a dungheap with his teeth. He died worth, the Lord knows what—all ready cash. But he was a foul-mouthed, rough-tongued, quarrelsome fellow. He had words with his brother, and left his money to somebody's love-child. The fourth speaker, Ganymede, is a pessimist and a Churchman. He complains that their talk is about things that concern nobody. Nothing matters but the scarcity of food. He has not been able to fill his belly for a twelvemonth. A plague on these food controllers and bakers! They play into each other's hands. Wink at me, and I'll wink at you. No wonder that the poor man has to work double shifts, if he has to keep the great jaws of these fellows going. When old Safinius was alive—he used to live just by the old arch—things were different. Corn was as cheap as dirt. You could buy more bread for a farthing than any two men could eat in a day. But now we go from bad to worse, and grow, like a cow's tail, downwards. And why so? We have a rascally market-clerk, who thinks more of feathering his own nest than of keeping us alive. No wonder he laughs in his sleeve. He scrapes up more money in a day than many an honest man's whole estate. If we had any real men among us, he would laugh the other side of his mouth. But nowadays people roar like lions at home, and baa like sheep in the street. My clothes are gone in food already. If corn keeps at its present price, I shall have to sell my shanty, and everything. I really believe that it is all a judgment from Heaven, because nobody believes that there is any such place, or would give a pin's head for Jupiter. Time was when our married women, with pure hearts, their feet bare, and their hair down their backs, prayed to Jupiter for rain, and rain it did—in buckets. Now we have no religion, and our fields lie. . . .

Don't be so dismal, interrupts Echion, more prosperous and an optimist. Better luck next time, as the countryman said, when he lost his speckled pig. What doesn't happen to-day

may happen to-morrow. That's the way the world wags. Heaven is just as far off wherever you live. If you lived somewhere else, you would say that here, porkers ran about ready roasted. That reminds me. We are going to have some real good shows these holydays. Titus will see to that. He's true-bred—no mongrel—and has the money. He won't put us off with a lot of old doddering hirelings that you could blow flat with a puff. Not he! His men will be freedmen, and the theatre will be like a butcher's shambles. Glyco is sending his steward to the beasts. He caught him in bed with his mistress. And what sin was the slave doing? As like as not, he only did as he was bid. It is the slut of a wife who ought to be gored by the bull. But if you can't hit the ass, you must thrash the saddle. And what business had Glyco to expect anything better from the daughter of Hermogenes? He would have cut the claws of a flying kite. Snakes don't father halters. I see, Agamemnon, that you are saying to yourself, 'What is this dull 'fool maundering about?' I only talk because you, who can, won't. I know that you are above our sort, and look down on us common folk. But, outside your book-learning, we know you for a fool. Take a walk into the country, and see us in our little cottage. We won't starve, I warrant you—a chicken, some eggs, and such like. You'll find my little 'Cicaro,' who is growing up to be your scholar. The boy takes kindly to his books. I tell him that, if he gets learning, the devil himself cannot take it away from him. It is a man's bank, and there's always a living in a trade.

Here Trimalchio returns, and again takes command of the conversation. The brief condensed paraphrase necessarily sacrifices the spirit and vivacity of the original. But it may serve to illustrate the method of treatment, to vindicate the claim of the *Satyricon* to have created a new kind of literature, and to justify its title to be considered the first of modern novels. It is regrettable that its indecency has condemned a work of genius to comparative obscurity. Yet the power of its humorous realism survives. In the twentieth century, Nietzsche, Merejkowski, and Anatole France—to mention three writers of various types and different nationalities — have acknowledged the influence of Petronius.

ERNLE.

SAMUEL BUTLER

1. **Samuel Butler, Author of 'Erewhon'** (1835-1902). A Memoir. By HENRY FESTING JONES. 2 vols. Macmillan & Co. 1919.
2. **The Way of All Flesh.** A Novel. By SAMUEL BUTLER. Grant Richards. 1903.
3. **The Note-Books of Samuel Butler.** Selections arranged and edited by HENRY FESTING JONES. Fifield. 1912.

LET it be said at once that Mr. Henry Festing Jones' 'Life of Samuel Butler' tells the history of a very remarkable man with a vividness which leaves nothing to be desired. This is not a vain compliment; it is a tribute which common justice demands on an unusual occasion. There were ninety-nine chances in a hundred that Butler's life would never be adequately, or even intelligently, recorded. Nature and circumstance had done their best to make him obscure and incomprehensible. The situation has been saved by two facts: the first, that Butler was excessively interested in himself; the second, that Mr. Jones was always—not merely since Butler's death, but always—excessively interested in Butler. These are not conditions which are essential to the success of biography in every case, especially when the general unanimity of admiration has made all the contemporaries of a great man in some sort his biographers, but they are absolutely required to preserve for us the features of an eccentric and isolated person who failed almost all through his life to attract admiration, and who laid himself out to be completely misunderstood when the tide should at last turn in his favour. We are preserved from such a loss by the meticulous attention which Samuel Butler paid to himself, and by the infatuated zeal with which Mr. Jones adopted, continued, and developed that attention. Butler lives twice over, or rather has never ceased to live, in the mind and humour of Mr. Henry Festing Jones.

We move in an age which prides itself more and more on being able to see the mote in the eye of its immediate predecessor. But Samuel Butler was the precursor of this rebellion, and is historically notable as the earliest anti-Victorian. He was born at a moment which was to prove less rich than almost any other of the remarkable nineteenth

century, in producing men who were to be eminent for intellectual talent. It almost looks as though Nature, which had been so profuse, and was presently to become so liberal again, paused for a few years, while she prepared to let the Victorian Age proper wear itself out. The immediate contemporaries of Butler were Shorthouse, whose 'John Inglesant' started a new sentimentality, and William Morris, who combined a fresh aspect of romance with an investigation of the bases of society which was essentially revolutionary; with these were T. H. Green, who introduced a new Hegelian spirit into philosophical speculation, and John Richard Green, who re-examined the foundations of our history. But none of these men displayed any real parallelism with Butler, by whose work they were none of them at any time affected, and of whom perhaps none of them ever heard. The only other name which can be quoted in this connexion is that of Lecky, who may indeed be regarded as the exact opposite of Butler in almost every respect—successful from earliest youth, at peace with the world, reverently acceptive of every Victorian formula, and blandly unconscious that everything was not permanently for the best in the best of all possible worlds.

Butler is a curious example of a man of something very like genius, who passed through a long life in the midst of intelligent fellow-men, not rebuffing their attentions, but encouraging them; not escaping by a morbid modesty from criticism, but doing everything in his power to exasperate it; and yet failing to be observed. The strange thing about his case is that he lived, mostly in London, for sixty-six years, and that until nearly the close of that time scarcely anyone felt more than the most tepid and casual curiosity about him. The only similar case that occurs to the memory in the history of nineteenth-century literature is Borrow, who in like manner, but not with a like desolating completeness, simply was unable to catch the eye of criticism. When each of these writers died, it seemed impossible that either of them would ever occupy half a page in any history of literature. It now seems equally difficult to suppose that any such history, if possessing the least pretension to completeness, will in future omit either of them. This is quite apart from any question which may present itself as to the probability of a decline in the present 'fashion' for them both. It merely expresses the fact that while Borrow and

Butler alike walked all through their lives invisible, for the rest of time they must both be patent, whether liked or disliked.

Borrow affected a certain disdain for the laudation which would not come his way, and in later life seemed to have relinquished any desire to move in the mouths of men. But Butler never ceased to long for fame, and probably to expect it. Towards the close of his life, whenever he was asked what new work might be expected from his ingenious pen, he used to look demure and answer, 'I am editing my remains; I wish 'to leave everything in order for my executors.' This was looked upon as a joke, but it turns out to have been strictly true. No one ever laboured more to appear at his best—in strict accordance with truth, but still, at his best—to the world after his decease. His assiduities were like those of the dying Narcissa—

> 'And Betty, give those cheeks a little red,
> One wouldn't, sure, look horrid when one's dead!'

He recovered as many of his own letters as he could and annotated them; he arranged the letters of his friends; he copied, edited, indexed, and dated all this mass of correspondence, and he prepared those 'Notes' which have since his death provided his admirers with their choicest repast. In doing all this he displayed an equal *naïveté* and enthusiasm. Mr. Festing Jones, to whom all this industry has of course been invaluable, puts the matter in a nutshell when he says that Butler 'was not contemplating publication, but neither was 'he contemplating oblivion.' He was simply putting the rouge-pot within Betty's reach.

Here is Butler's own account of the matter, and it throws a strong light upon his character:—

> 'People sometimes give me to understand that it is a piece of ridiculous conceit on my part to jot down so many notes about myself, since it implies a confidence that I shall one day be regarded as an interesting person. I answer that neither I nor they can form any idea as to whether I shall be wanted when I am gone or no. The chances are that I shall not.'

But he was not inclined to take any risks. He was the residuary of his own temperament, and if by chance posterity were to wake up and take a violent interest in him, he personally would be to blame, and would incur a very serious responsibility, if there were no documents forthcoming to satisfy

the curiosity of the new generation. It is to his frank response to this instinct of self-preservation that we owe the very exhaustive and faithful narrative before us, as we did the precious 'Note-Books' of 1912.

In consideration of the eagerness and sympathy with which Butler is followed by an active group of admirers among the young writers of to-day, it may be doubtful whether the extraordinary minuteness of Butler's observation, continued as it is with an equally extraordinary fullness by Mr. Festing Jones, may not have an evil effect in encouraging a taste for excessive discursiveness in authorship of this class. There have been very distinguished examples lately of abandonment to an unchecked notation of detail. It is scarcely necessary to refer to the texture of the later novels of Henry James, or to the amazing 'Côté de chez Swann' of M. Marcel Proust, which latter is one of the most characteristic successes of the moment. This widespread tendency to consider every slight observation, whether phenomenal or emotional, worthy of the gravest and tenderest analysis, develops at an epoch when the world is becoming congested with printed matter, and when one might imagine that conciseness and selection would be the qualities naturally in fashion. Neither Samuel Butler nor his biographer conceives it possible that anything can be negligible; to them the meanest flower that blows by the wayside of experience gives thoughts that cannot be brought to lie within one or even within ten pages. The complacency with which Butler annotates his own childish letters to his mother is equalled only by the gravity with which Mr. Jones examines those very annotations.

Not without a qualm, however, do I note this redundancy, since it is a source of pleasure to all but the hasty reader, who, indeed, should be advised not to approach Butler at all. The charm of his mind lies in its divagations, its inconsistencies, its puerile and lovable self-revelations, and all these are encouraged by the wandering style common to the author and to his biographer. One of the most clear-sighted of his friends, trying to sum up his character at his death, said that 'he was 'too versatile a genius ever to be in the front rank of one 'particular line, and he had too much fun in him to be really 'serious when he ought to have been.' But why ought he to have been 'really serious,' and why should he have sought 'front rank' in one particular line? This is the inevitable way

in which a man of ingenious originality is misjudged by those who have loved him most and who think they understood him best. Butler was not remarkable, and does not now deserve the reputation which his name enjoys, on account of the subjects about which he chose to write, nor on account of the measure of decorum with which he approached those themes, but in consequence of the sinuous charm, the irregular and arresting originality of his approach itself, his fame having been indeed rather delayed, and the purgatory of his obscurity prolonged, by the want of harmony between most of the subjects he selected and the manner in which it was native to himself to treat those subjects. In other words, what makes Butler a difficult theme for analysis is that, unlike most authors, his genius is not illuminated, but positively obscured for a student of to-day, by the majority of his controversial writings. He was not a prophet; he was an inspired 'crank.' He is most characteristic, not when he is discussing Evolution, or Christianity, or the Sonnets of Shakespeare, or the Trapanese Origin of the 'Odyssey,' but when he is meandering along, endlessly, paradoxically, in the act of written conversation about everything at large and nothing in particular, with himself as the central theme.

The most valuable of Butler's imaginative writings, and indeed the most important from almost every point of view, are the two romances which stand respectively at the opening and at the close of his career, like two golden pillars supporting the roof of his reputation. His earliest publication (for the slight and brief budget of letters from New Zealand was not published by himself) was 'Erewhon'—or Nowhere—a fantastic Utopia of the class started a century-and-a-half ago by Paltock in his fascinating adventures of 'Peter Wilkins.' Like Wilkins, the hero of 'Erewhon' flies from civilisation, and discovers in the Antarctic world a race of semi-human beings, who obey a strict code of morals consistent in itself, but in complete divergence from ours on many important points. I discover no evidence that Butler ever saw Paltock's romance, and he would probably have been scornful of the Glums and Gowries, and of the gentle winged people wrapped in throbbing robes of their own substance. But I think some dim report of an undiscovered country where ethics were all turned topsy-turvy may have started him on 'Erewhon.' The other novel, that which closes Butler's career

as a writer, is 'The Way of All Flesh,' without a careful consideration of which, by the light of information now supplied by Mr. Festing Jones, no sketch of Butler's career can, for the future, be attempted.

As early as 1873, Butler confided to Miss Savage—of whose place in his life and influence upon his genius I shall presently have to speak—that he was contemplating the composition of an autobiographical novel. She read the opening, and wrote, 'as far as it goes it is perfect, and if you go on as you have 'begun, it will be a beautiful book.' In case he got tired of it, what he had already written might make 'a very nice finished 'sketch for a magazine.' Evidently Miss Savage, who had an almost uncanny penetration into Butler's nature, had little confidence in his perseverance in the conduct of so large a design. She urged him on however, and it very early occurred to her that the value of the story would consist in its complete veracity as an autobiography. She faced Butler with the charge that he was not being faithful to himself in this matter, and she said, 'Is the narrator of the story to be an impartial historian 'or a special pleader?' Butler wriggled under her strictures, but failed to escape from them. Finally she faced him with a direct question :—

'You have chosen the disguise of an old man of seventy-three [exactly double Butler's real age at that time]. and must speak and act as such. An old man of seventy-three would scarcely talk as you do, unless he was constantly in your company, and was a very docile old man indeed—and I don't think the old man who is telling the story is at all docile.'

Young or old, Butler was never 'docile,' and he was not inclined to give up his idealism without a struggle. But Miss Savage was indomitable. She continued to undermine what she called 'the special pleader,' on the ground that 'I prefer an 'advocate in flesh and blood.' Under this pressure, and stimulated by Miss Savage's ingenuous annotations, Butler adopted more and more a realistic tone, and kept the story more and more closely on autobiographic lines. It was progressing steadily when Butler had to go to Canada on the business expedition which cost him so many months of his life, and when he returned to London he did not resume the novel. He took it up again in 1878, and disliked it; it needed Miss Savage's energy to start him again with proper gusto. Mr. Festing Jones was by this

time upon the spot, and though he does not say so, he probably supported Miss Savage. They were the Aaron and Hur who held up the arms of this incorrigible 'special pleader,' and insisted that he should stick to the truth, and not embroider it. In 1884 'The Way of All Flesh' was finished; in 1885 it underwent some revision, and after that was not touched again.

So long as Butler was alive, the uncompromising revelations of his family life, and the bitterness of the censure of living persons, which the novel contained, made it impossible to dream of issuing it. To do so would have been to break a nest of hornets over Butler's pate. But the moment he was dead, his executor, the late Mr. R. A. Streatfeild, acting upon the author's known wishes, published 'The Way of All Flesh.' This was in 1903, and the publication synchronised with the surprising burst of critical appreciation which the announcement of Butler's death had awakened in the Press. In almost all unprejudiced quarters the value of 'The Way of All Flesh,' as a sincere and masterly contribution to imaginative literature, was acknowledged, although it took five years more for a second edition of the book to be called for. Butler, however, was recognised at last as an author of distinguished merit, and there was a reverberation of curiosity concerning so remarkable a man who had walked about among us for nearly seventy years without attracting any particular attention. This curiosity, it was indicated by his admirers, could now be assuaged by a study of 'The Way of All Flesh,' which was a faithful portrait of the writer, and of all the persons who had checked his growth or encouraged his development. So the legend was started that no real 'Life of Samuel Butler' was required, because in 'The 'Way of All Flesh' we already possessed a complete one.

Apart from the fact that the best of autobiographies can never be the 'real life,' because it can never depict the man quite as others saw him, it now transpires—and this is perhaps the most important feature of Mr. Festing Jones' admirable volumes —that the novel cannot be accepted as an autobiography sound at all points. In spite of the warnings of Miss Savage, and, oddly enough, most of all in the person of Miss Savage herself, Butler was incapable of confronting the incidents of his own life without colouring them, and without giving way to prejudice in the statement of plain facts. He disliked excessively the atmosphere of middle-class Evangelicism in which he had been

brought up, and we must dislike it too, but we need not dislike the persons involved so bitterly as Butler did. It was narrow, sterile and cruel, and it deserved no doubt the irony which Butler expended upon it. So long as we regard 'The Way of 'All Flesh' as a story, invented with the help of recollections which the novelist was at liberty to modify in any way he thought desirable, there is no quarrel to be picked with any part of it. But when we are led, as we have been, to take it as a full and true record of Butler's own life, with nothing changed but the names of the persons, we see by the light of Mr. Festing Jones that this is an absolutely untenable position. 'The Way of 'All Flesh' is not an autobiography, but a romance founded on recollection.

The author of 'Erewhon,' who was christened Samuel, not in honour of the author of 'Hudibras,' but in memory of his own grandfather, the Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry, was the son of Canon Thomas Butler, incumbent of Langor-with-Branston, in Nottinghamshire, where the younger Samuel was born on the 4th of December 1835. Readers of 'The Way of All Flesh' may recognise the Butler family at Langor in the very unflattering picture of the Pontifexes in that novel. The Bishop's grandson disliked him very much indeed—'bullying, irritable, 'stupid old turkey-cock,'—until 1887, when he got hold of the Bishop's letters and papers, 'and fell over head and ears in love 'with him.' He excused his earlier sarcasms by saying—'When 'I wrote harshly describing him, I knew nothing about my 'grandfather except that he had been a great schoolmaster—and 'I do not like schoolmasters; and then a bishop—and I do not 'like bishops; and that he was supposed to be like my father.' For the latter, who is Theobald Pontifex in 'The Way of All 'Flesh,' he never expressed any leniency whatever, yet it is impossible to avoid hoping that if he had studied his father, as at the age of fifty he studied his grandfather, he might have relented a little in that instance also.

Ernest Pontifex says, in 'The Way of All Flesh,' that he could remember no feeling towards his parents during his childhood except fear and shrinking. To Butler, fathers in general, as a class, were 'capable de tout,' like the prophet Habakkuk. Mr. Festing Jones prints a very explicit paper he has found on this subject, the least distressing paragraph in which is the last, where Butler says, 'An unkind fate never

'threw two men together who were more naturally uncongenial 'than my father and myself.' Canon Butler was an evangelical clergyman of the Simeonite type, which flourished so intensely before and during the development of the High Church revival. He believed in bringing up children rigidly, from their infancy, in the strict practice of external religion. If they were recalcitrant, the love of God must be driven into them by their being whipped or shut up in a cupboard, or docked of some little puerile pleasure. Samuel Butler secretly rebelled, from babyhood, against this stern evangelical discipline, and the Canon, who had no imagination, simply redoubled his severities. It is an amusing touch, in this record of a dismal childhood, to learn that Samuel was excessively pleased, at the age of eight, by hearing an Italian lady in Naples say that a dear young friend of hers—poor unfortunate fellow, 'povero disgraziato!'—had been obliged to murder his uncle and his aunt. Probably the pleasure the little boy felt in hearing of this 'misfortune' was the earliest expression of that rebellious and fantastic dislike of conventionality which was to run through the whole series of the man's works.

In the letters from Butler to his family, written at school and at college, there is however no trace of the violent antagonism which he afterwards believed that he had always felt. It is true that a boy who writes to his father and mother, and indeed in similar circumstances a man too, is constrained to resign himself to a certain innocent hypocrisy. Very few children are able to send to their parents, and very few parents are able to endure from their children, a perfectly sincere description of their crude sentiments during adolescence. But if Samuel Butler was really tormented at home, as Ernest Pontifex was, it is odd that some note of hostility should not have crept into his juvenile correspondence. However, Mr. Festing Jones, who is as judicious as a Lord of Appeal, seems to entertain no doubt that Canon Butler was a holy horror, so that we must bow to his opinion.

The earliest overt evidence of a falling out between father and son is delayed until, in Mr. Jones' unfaltering narrative, we reach the son's twenty-third year. He does not seem, at first, to have combated his father's obstinate demand that he should take orders in the Church of England. That Canon Butler, a clergyman of clergymen, should have desired to see his

Samuel take this step, ought not to seem unreasonable, though it certainly proved unlucky. In the novel, it will be remembered, Ernest Pontifex actually was ordained, but to this length Samuel Butler never proceeded. He went to a parish in the east of London to work with a parson who had been one of his grandfather's pupils at Shrewsbury. There his faith in the efficacy of infant baptism was shaken, and presently falling, brought down about his ears the whole fabric of Simeonite Christianity in which he had so assiduously been trained. He suddenly, and no doubt abruptly, wrote to the Canon and said that he 'declined to be ordained.' From a carnal as well as a spiritual point of view this must have been a nasty shock for his parents, and Mr. Festing Jones tells us 'there was a long and 'painful correspondence.' This he mercifully spares us, but refers us to 'The Way of All Flesh,' where Butler made dauntless use of it.

The financial situation was difficult. Canon Butler was fairly well-to-do, but he had other children to provide for, and Samuel, who refused to be a clergyman, went on refusing, as it must have seemed to his father, to be anything at all. Like the poet Cowley, he

> 'neither great at Court nor in the War,
> Nor at the Exchange would be, nor at the wrangling Bar.'

All professions were suggested, and each in vain. At last it was decided that Samuel should emigrate to New Zealand, and become a sheep farmer. Only nine years earlier, a Church of England colony had been founded at Canterbury, in the South Island, and the town of Christchurch had been founded. It had enjoyed a great success, and by the year 1859, when Butler landed, almost all the sheep lands had been already taken up. At last he found an unoccupied run at the 'back of beyond,' and built a little homestead for himself, which he called Mesopotamia. It is needless to dwell on this episode of Butler's life, further than to point out that it proved him capable of sustained physical industry and of considerable financial adroitness. The remainder of his career hardly suggests the possession of either. The New Zealand episode is sufficiently dealt with in Butler's own book, 'A First Year in Canterbury 'Settlement,' which, by the way, shows no trace of the author's subsequent merit as a writer. In June 1864 he sailed home-

ward from the port of Lyttleton, but not alone, and we now approach the strangest incident of his life.

It was to be expected that the £4400 which Butler had received from his father in 1859 would by this time have dwindled to zero. Not at all; it had swelled to £8000. But just before he left New Zealand a young man, called Charles Pauli, whom he had known but very slightly as a journalist in Christchurch, and who had no claim upon Butler of any sort or species, came to him and asked him to pay for his passage back to England, and to advance him £200 a year for three years. 'To me,' wrote Butler in 1897, 'in those days this 'seemed perfectly easy; and Pauli, I have not the smallest 'doubt, intended and fully believed—for his temperament was 'always sanguine—that he should be able to repay me.' Butler had very little insight into the 'temperament' of Pauli, and the whole of the extraordinary story increases our conviction that this sardonic and sarcastic analyst of imaginary life was as powerless as a child in face of reality. The dreadful Pauli adventure, told for the first time by Mr. Festing Jones, in his deliberate, unimpassioned way, is the most amazing revelation of simplicity traded upon by fraud that it is possible to imagine.

There soon proved to be a complete absence of harmony in the tastes of Butler and Pauli, who had really nothing in common. Yet they settled together, when they arrived in London, in rooms in Clifford's Inn, Fleet Street. There Butler lived for all the rest of his life, thirty-eight years; but presently Pauli went elsewhere. Then the relations of the two became incomprehensible. Pauli was very irritable, and constantly found fault with Butler. He refused to let Butler know his address, and yet was continually sponging upon him. He said that he could get no help from his own parents, and that Butler stood between him and starvation. For three years Pauli did not attempt to work. At last, in 1867, he was called to the Bar. He lunched with Butler three times a week, when he always said that he was earning nothing. Butler's own statement, written in 1898, the year after Pauli's death, is as follows:—

'I have no means of ascertaining how much Pauli had from me between the years 1864 and 1881 (but it exceeded £3500). I kept no accounts; I took no receipts from him; the understanding was that he would repay me when he came into his reversion. . . . In 1879 I only admitted to my father having helped Pauli from time to time; the fact was, I had done everything. . . . I had more than shared every

penny I had with him, but I believed myself to be doing it out of income, and to have a right to do it.'

Throughout the long periods in which Butler was hard pressed for sufficient money to exist—times in which there were painful and unseemly squabbles about an allowance between his father and himself—he was supporting Pauli, whose means of subsistence he took no pains to investigate, and who, in full cognition of Butler's attenuated sources of income, punctually took half for himself. Mr. Festing Jones' statement is amazing:—

'Pauli was called to the Bar in 1867, and took chambers in Lincoln's Inn for his work. He told Butler where they were, so that he could write if he had any communication to make to him that would not wait till they met; *but Butler was not to go there.* Of course, he could have gone, but he did not. He could have found out in a hundred ways where Pauli lived if he had set about it; but, knowing that Pauli did not wish it, he did nothing.'

At last, in 1897, after having shared his poverty with this strange friend for thirty-three years, Butler read in *The Times* that Pauli was dead. Then, at last, he made inquiries, and found that for a great many years past Pauli's income from the law had exceeded £700 a year, and for nearly twenty had been over £1000. Pauli left £9000, not a penny of it to Butler, whose parasite he had been for the greater part of his life, when every five-pound note was of consequence to Butler. One knows not which to be more astounded at—heartless greediness on the one side, or fatuous simplicity on the other. When all the evidence came out at last beyond all further concealment, Butler wrote:—'I understand now why Pauli preserved such an 'iron silence when I implored him to deal with me somewhat 'after the fashion in which I had dealt with him.' [That is to say, in telling him precisely what Butler's exact financial position was.] 'The iniquity of the whole thing, as it first 'struck me in full force, upset me.'

This 'squalid and miserable story' is told with inexorable fullness by Mr. Festing Jones. What is very remarkable about it is the evidence it gives of Butler's irregular penetration into character. He could be extremely acute in one direction and absolutely obtuse in another. The incredible indulgence which permitted him to be the dupe and victim of a scoundrel like Pauli for more than thirty years seems incompatible with the intense and suspicious analysis which he expended on the

motives of his father. After all, when the worst of Canon Butler is admitted, he was a Christian and a gentleman by the side of the appalling Pauli. Yet Butler would sacrifice his father, and actually tell falsehoods for the purpose of screening and enriching Pauli (see Vol. I., p. 114), of whose villany he could at any moment have assured himself, and with whom he practically admits that he had nothing in common.

The Pauli episode is valuable in supplying light on certain defects in Butler's intellectual composition. In measure, it tends to explain the inconsistencies, the irregularities of his mental life, and of his action as a scholar. He was the opposite of those who see life steadily, and see it whole. He had no wide horizons, but he investigated a corner or a section of a subject with a burning glass which left all other parts of the surface in darkness. There were Paulis on his mental horizon ; there were in almost everything he approached passages where his want of appreciation, his want (let us boldly say) of elementary insight, produced the oddest effect of imperfection. His literary judgments were *saugrenu* to the last extreme. What are we to think of a man who lays it down that 'Blake was no good 'because he learnt Italian to study Dante, and Dante was no 'good because he was so fond of Virgil, and Virgil was no 'good because Tennyson ran him ; and as for Tennyson, well, 'Tennyson goes without saying'? There is no critical meaning in such outbursts ; they would be almost imbecile in their aimless petulance if we did not understand that Virgil and Dante and Blake lay in the dark segment of Butler's vision, and that he had not so much formed an adverse opinion of their merits as no opinion at all. If, as surprisingly he did on every occasion, he heaped contempt on Virgil, it was simply because he wanted to get Virgil well out of the way of Homer, on whom his enthusiasm was concentrated.

It was so in all things. Butler despised the great Venetian painters, not because he had devoted attention to their faults, but because they stood in the way of Giovanni and Gentile Bellini, to whom he had dedicated a frenzied cult. 'Titian, 'Leonardo, Raffaelle and Michel Angelo, well, to speak quite 'plainly, I like none of them,' he wrote in the last year of his life. In music it was just the same. Butler attached himself, from early youth to the grave, to Handel in an almost maniacal infatuation. In order to clear a space, as it were, round this

solitary object of his worship, he covered Beethoven and Bach with contempt; and if anyone forced him to listen to the 'Requiem' of Mozart, he stopped his ears and hummed 'Loathsome urns, disclose your treasure,' to drown the hideous Austrian discord. For Butler, 'Bach wriggles; Wagner writhes.' All the masterpieces of the world of music he sweeps together in a universal disapproval as 'heartless failures,' whereas of Handel's least remarkable passages he calls out, 'Can human genius do 'more?' The result is that Butler is interesting and sometimes valuable when he praises; when he blames, he is sometimes amusing, but more often impertinent and tiresome. What is the point of calling Plato one of the 'Seven Humbugs of Christendom,' or of talking of 'that damned Republic'? To pretend to admire these peevish outbursts, however much we may be stimulated by the better sides of Butler's intelligence, is abject.

No section of Mr. Festing Jones' biography is more interesting than that in which, in the patient, judicious manner in which he so eminently excels, he depicts the relation of Butler to Miss Savage. Readers of 'The Way of All Flesh' are familiar with the figure of Alethea Pontifex, who occupies the position of heroine in that novel. It has long been known that this was the portrait of a friend whom Butler had studied, confided in, and deeply valued. In what degree it was an accurate portrait has not hitherto been known. I have no hesitation in saying that the chapters which deal with this situation—and they are executed with as much delicacy as realism—form the most unhackneyed and the most exciting section of Mr. Jones' volumes. They illuminate in portions, and they leave darker than ever in other parts, the rugged surface of Butler's extraordinary character; and I regret that exigencies of space do not permit me to do justice to documents so remarkable. But yet, something I must say.

The Alethea of the novel was so far from being an exact portrait that the sitter, after studying every line and touch of it, is supposed, was supposed by Butler himself, not to have perceived that it was intended for her. This however we must regard as hardly possible in the case of one so passionately clear-sighted, but there were many reasons why she should adopt such an attitude. Eliza Mary Ann Savage was a governess, whom Butler met about 1870, when he and she were art-students together at Heatherley's. They were nearly of the same age, which at that time would be thirty-four. They were immediately

drawn together by a singular parallelism in temper and sympathy. Miss Savage read the MS. of 'Erewhon,' and minutely criticised it. From this time, 1871 to 1885, when she died, Butler submitted to her everything he wrote, and, obstinate as he was in the face of all other censures, invariably remodelled his work in accordance with her criticisms and suggestions. She supported him in all his enthusiasms, and shared all his prejudices. She was a very well-read woman, and was able to follow Butler into the remotest recesses of his studies. She responded to his lightest touch like a delicate musical instrument, and yet was rigid in opposing any divergence from what she conceived to be the normal line his talent ought to take. She was as stringently hostile to Christianity, as contemptuous of Darwin and Huxley, as infatuated about Handel, as haughtily an *enfant terrible* of the intelligence as he was, and the degree to which the admirers of Butler's books are indebted to her can never be definitely known, but is certainly very great.

Alethea Pontifex, in 'The Way of All Flesh,' is tall, handsome, with fine blue eyes. Miss Savage was short, insignificant, and plain, with brown eyes; she suffered from hip disease; physically, she was quite unattractive. This introduces into the real history an element of pathos and of pain which raises it to a far higher level of human interest than the novel has to offer us. To Miss Savage, in her isolated state, Butler was the whole world; and it is perfectly evident—Mr. Festing Jones need not hesitate so conscientiously in admitting it—that she was absorbingly, unalterably in love with Butler. She lived, quite unupbraiding, in the intermittent light of his countenance. For nearly twenty years they were, mentally, like a devoted husband and wife, yet the anomaly of their relations never struck Butler, to whom Miss Savage was a comrade of perfect sympathy, and no more. He did not observe, until Miss Savage was dead, that she had felt towards him otherwise than he felt towards her. He wrote, 'I valued her, but she perfectly understood that I 'could do no more.' Did she? Mr. Festing Jones prints a sonnet of Butler's, written in 1901, which seems to me to be one of the most amazing pieces of self-revelation that I know:—

> 'And now, though twenty years are come and gone,
> That little lame lady's face is with me still;
> Never a day but what, on every one,
> She dwells with me as dwell she ever will.

She said she wished I knew not wrong from right;
It was not that; I knew, and would have chosen
Wrong if I could, but, in my own despite,
Power to choose wrong in my chilled veins was frozen.
'Tis said that if a woman woo, no man
Should leave her till she have prevailed; and, true,
A man will yield for pity if he can,
But if the flesh rebels, what can he do?
I could not; hence I grieve my whole life long
The wrong I did in that I did no wrong.'

Such fragments of Miss Savage's letters as are here printed show that she was an admirable correspondent. Butler put her letters together in a separate collection, edited, annotated, and ready for the Press. This is to be published some day in a volume by itself, and will have a pathetic value. But I confess to a certain feeling of regret that the inner being of this obscure, pathetic, and self-sacrificing woman should be immolated any further on the altar of Butler's egotism. My own instinct would be to say: Let poor Miss Savage, out of whose painful and imperfect existence so much 'copy' has already been made, sleep on undisturbed under her mouldering headstone at Finchley. But Mr. Festing Jones knows best.

The most agreeable parts of this biography, at all events those which give us the most genial impression of Butler as a companion, deal with his repeated visits to Italy. These tours inspired, or were used to produce material for, a very pleasant section of his literary work. If we distinguish between the wit and picturesqueness of the ornament in Butler's controversial writings, and the actual basal texture of those writings, I do not see how a reasonable criticism can any longer pretend to set high value on his angry denunciations of the whole Darwinian theory of evolution, or on his diatribes about Unconscious Memory. There is a terrible work of his, published in 1887, called 'Luck or Cunning as the Main Means of Organic Modification'; there is another, of 1882, called 'Evolution, Old and New.' They are unreadable. His religious polemic was even more disagreeable than his scientific, and the lumbering sarcasm of the attack on Christianity, called 'The Fair Haven,' is an epitome of all that is most unpleasing in the attitude of Butler. Unctuous sarcasm so sustained as to deceive the very elect, and 'affectation of the tone of indignant orthodoxy,' have a tendency to grow rancid in the passage of years, and to become exceedingly unappetising. Samuel Butler, whose rashness was

astounding, had the courage to call his homonym of the 'Analogy' a 'poor creature'! What would Joseph Butler, revisiting the glimpses of the moon, think of the author of 'The Fair Haven'?

There is nothing of this incongruity in the books which are founded on memories of Italian travel. Here the charm of Butler's style is expended, with a thousand oddities and playfulnesses, on subjects which blossom in its atmosphere. It is very strange that 'Alps and Sanctuaries' (1882), and 'Ex Voto' (1888), should share the neglect which was so unbrokenly the fate of Butler's publications, for these were charming and original to a high degree, and they illustrate, without any disadvantage, the whimsical penetration of his mind and the playful melody of his style at its best. 'The Authoress of the 'Odyssey' (1897), which Hellenists found it impossible to take as a serious contribution to scholarship, was another of these by-products of travel in Sicily, and contained very numerous pages, which, whether convincing or no, were exceedingly picturesque and entertaining. No cultivated man or woman will, in the future, visit Trapani or ascend to the platforms of Mount Eryx without remembering how Butler was taken to the grotto where Ulysses hid his treasure, or how the Sicilian descendants of the Cyclopes treated him like a royal personage.

Not much new light is thrown on the purely literary characteristics of Butler by Mr. Festing Jones' biography. He has not dwelt at length on the individual works, nor at all on the general position of their author among his contemporaries. He left himself no space to go into such questions, being fully occupied with the task of interpreting and illuminating the personal characteristics of his subject. He is an unflinching portraitist, and in a painting of Oliver Cromwell from the life would be sure to do full justice to the wen. The rugged surface of Samuel Butler lends itself to such realism—and I will not say that Mr. Jones does not approach the confines of the superfluous in the excessive minuteness of his notes. We are assured that Butler took eight handkerchiefs and three pairs of socks with him when he went abroad, and that he very wisely carried diarrhœa pills in the handle half of his Gladstone bag. When Butler bought himself a new wash-hand basin, in 1887, the fact is duly recorded. We are told that once, in 1886, he swept every corner of every room of his lodgings with tea-leaves, and that it made him perspire freely. That there will be readers

who do not care how many times Butler brushed his hair every day, nor on what occasion he wore 'the high hat which appears 'in the corner of the picture in his room,' I am not inclined to deny, but I am not of them. These little things, recounted with Mr. Festing Jones' humorous serenity, are my delight. If some contemporary had recorded the fact that Shakespeare habitually soaked the crust of his manchet in his last mouthful of sack, or that he wore out his left shoe faster than his right, how grateful we should be for the information. Only, there must come into our consideration: Are Butler and Shakespeare figures of equal significance, apart from their shoes and their hair-brushes?

There is less room for divergence of judgment on the question of the way in which Mr. Jones has revealed the moral and social characteristics of his hero. Here he could hardly be excessive. The amiability, the ruggedness, the nervous instability, the obstinacy as of a rock, the tenderness and the sardonic bitterness which made up so strange an amalgam, are all frankly revealed. It is for us to arrange them, if we can, into a consistent portrait of a most inconsistent figure. Here is, taken at random, an entry of Butler's own, which gives a good example of several of his characteristics:—

'17th April 1895. I travelled from Patros to Athens with a young Turk, about thirty years old, and his dog—an English terrier. We were alone in the carriage the greater part of the time, and I suppose the poor dog was bored; at any rate, after a while, he made up to me. He licked me all over my face, and then began to pretend that my coat pocket had got a rat in it which he must catch. I was so flattered at being made up to by anyone or anything who seemed to tell me I was a nice person, that I let him go on and hunt for rats all over me, till at last his master interposed in beautiful English, and then we talked. He was a Secretary to the Turkish Legation, and was very clever and nice.'

The incident could hardly be more trifling, but it is inimitably told; and it reveals not merely a mastery of minute description, but the self-tormenting temperament of a man of extraordinary talent who, for some unfathomable reason, though love was in his heart, was for ever out of harmony with the world, and suspicious of those whom he would fain have ingratiated. Those are the main lineaments which Mr. Festing Jones' biography reveals, and they are those of a miniaturist touching his ivory with a fastidious brush, and of a 'born orphan' who could not find a home in the wilderness of jarring humanity.

EDMUND GOSSE.

BIRD-WATCHING AS A HOBBY

1. **British Birds.** Written and illustrated by A. THORBURN, F.Z.S. In four volumes. Longmans, Green & Co. 1915 and 1916.
2. **A Naturalist's Sketch Book.** By ARCHIBALD THORBURN, F.Z.S. Longmans, Green & Co. 1919.

THE pleasure and advantages of a hobby are recognised by nearly every one. For most of us, life consists of work directed to an end. Whatever our occupation may be, it becomes a business which we are not free to take up or drop at will, but calls for constant attention and precision, and even in the most exalted spheres is certain to include a great amount of laborious and uninteresting detail. Moreover, however attractive our work may be, the close attention which it invariably demands creates a continuous physiological strain, which has to be set against the satisfaction of work done. And this circumstance limits the length of our working hours to a part only of the whole day, and a part which for most people is far less than a half. It thus comes about that one of the most important problems in life is what to do with the rest of our time: how to spend it without any physiological strain, and yet in a pleasurable and healthy manner.

The problem is solved by different people in widely different ways, according to their constitution. Many are amateur politicians, and pass their leisure in reading newspapers and abusing the Government—a pastime which does not appear generally to promote content, or to have any very advantageous results to the individual. To another type of mind, books present an unceasing source of pleasure; and so wide is the range of literature that there can be few who would not find in it some branch to suit their tastes, between philosophy at the one end and the latest French novels at the other. But here many are put off from not knowing how to begin, or what to read. Journalism, in the form of newspapers, is delivered into their houses automatically every day, and lies there waiting to be read. The higher branch of literature is not in the

same way forced upon them. It has to be looked up and specially asked for, and it costs perhaps a little more; though it will for ever remain true that a good book is one of the cheapest, most agreeable, and most profitable recreations open to the public at large. Then there are the peculiar individual hobbies, like that of Louis XVI., who spent his spare time in making locks. There is the whole range of games and sports. Some of these, such as bridge, do constitute some physiological tax, though they have other compensating advantages. To many gardening is a perennial attraction, or outdoor botany, while others find these pursuits too tame. Finally, there is bird-watching, which would probably be the most popular of all, if it were not in some respects the most difficult.

The study of birds may take many different forms. We may photograph them, or paint them, or study their habits, or shoot and preserve them, or dissect them in the interests of scientific ornithology, or collect their eggs; or we may be content without any ulterior purpose of this kind. Since in our working lives we have to be to a great extent professionals, we may in our hobbies determine to remain at any cost amateurs, free from the consciousness of any further object than that of satisfying our immediate pleasure and interest. And thus released from the burden of purpose, we may be content with the mere recognition of birds. Our aim will be fully achieved when we can instantly name any bird by the first glance at its form and colours, or by the first sound of its note. The very moderation of this ambition provides a guarantee against the risk of pleasure being sunk in the pursuit of knowledge. Birds become friends, rather than subjects of study; we come always more to like and admire them, rather than to analyse them or to secure trophies. The pleasure is that of social life, wholly freed from its efforts, conventions, and affectations.

The hobby of bird-watching has certain recommendations peculiarly its own. It takes the naturalist into the country in the most ideal conditions. It demands patience, vivacity, and capacity for observation. The constant alertness required is sufficient to drive out all thoughts of our normal life. It redeems country districts from their most conspicuous drawback—the provincialism and smallness of the human society;

for avian society is always interesting, always varied, and above all, always genuine. On the other hand, there are perhaps some disadvantages. It is essentially an occupation for solitude. Two persons going out together, however quiet and careful they may be, rarely see or hear as much as one person by himself. The mere presence of a second person seems to constitute some mental distraction; so that here at any rate two eyes are undoubtedly better than four.

The principal equipment needed is a strong pair of field-glasses. Since birds are extraordinarily vivacious in movement, it is important to become accustomed to one's glasses, as there is usually no time to waste in getting them on to the object and focussing them. Practice soon makes this automatic. The bird is then nearly always in the centre of the field, at the moment the glasses reach the eyes. In bringing them up, the distance likewise is judged, and the focus automatically adjusted, so that the bird stands out instantly in clear view. The method of approaching a bird is also a matter of importance. Frequently, the first intimation of the neighbourhood of an unusual bird is by a new and perhaps unrecognised note. The naturalist, knowing that he may only get the chance of a brief glimpse, will take care that it shall be under the most favourable conditions of vision. To that end, it is better to move, not as a rule directly towards the sound, but to make a circuit in such a way as to get the sun at the observer's back, and *then* to move slowly forward, especially avoiding any sudden movement of arm or body. Moreover, it is often difficult to judge the distance of a sound. The note of a marsh titmouse, for instance, and some of the nightingale's notes, often appear to be much farther off than they really are. The procedure then is to mark the line of direction of the sound, and again to move in a circuit around it, until a new line of direction is established. The bird is then located at the point where these two lines intersect.

The only other equipment necessary is a thoroughly good book of British birds; and this is now available *par excellence* in the works of Mr. Archibald Thorburn. The coloured plates, of which these works chiefly consist, are the most perfect representations of bird life that could well be imagined; admirable alike for their artistic beauty, their wonderful truth to Nature, and

their astonishing excellence of reproduction. Prior to the publication of this work, the fine volumes of Lord Lilford constituted the standard pictorial illustrations of British birds; and Mr. Thorburn himself was one of Lord Lilford's artists in that work. Beautiful as these drawings were, they are in some respects outclassed by the more recent work of Thorburn's 'British Birds' and 'The Naturalist's Sketch Book.' The price of Lord Lilford's work alone was such as to place it beyond the reach of all but a few. It does, however, give a whole plate to each bird; whereas Mr. Thorburn usually includes several different species in a single plate. This method, nevertheless, has certain advantages, for identification is facilitated when similar species are placed close together. It may also be remarked that, not only has the work of the artist improved in course of time, but the technical processes of reproduction have been immensely refined; so that in the volumes under notice we have what will assuredly remain for long, and without a rival, the standard work of illustrations of British birds. Attached to the coloured plates a brief description is given of each species, which, though far more cursory than the copious accounts in works like Yarrell, are yet all that the amateur field naturalist is likely to require.

With a good pair of glasses in the field, and Thorburn's 'Birds' at home, the pastime of bird-watching can be carried on in high luxury; and the normal pleasure of an interesting hobby is intensified by the constant association with Nature, and with beauty both of colour and of sound. At first, identification is difficult. To a complete beginner, many of the smaller birds seem very much alike, and the difference in their notes is not appreciated or recognised. But as one after another is identified, the process always becomes easier; for when a new bird is seen, we know at least what it is *not*, and there are perhaps only one or two other things that it can be. One who knows nothing of birds, and walks out for the first time with a field-glass to see what he can find, may perhaps see small brown birds which might be one of a dozen different things. One beginner was so distracted by this initial difficulty, that he shot one of these birds, and only after close comparison with the text-books did he finally discover it to be a titlark. Differentiation from the skylark followed, and the notes of the two birds soon appeared as distinctive as their appearance. For a considerable time

many species may be in the neighbourhood without their presence being suspected; once a species has been identified, it is apt to be often seen again; for if present, it will not again be overlooked or be confused with any other species. Thus a number of different species, all looking much alike, are at first simply comprised under the general (and erroneous) name of 'lark.' But after a time, more and more distinctions appear among them, till at last we recognise not only the skylark and the titlark, but also the woodlark, the tree pipit, and the rock pipit. The tree pipit is differentiated from the meadow pipit or titlark by its habits and song; the rock pipit is instantly identified by the absence of white outer tail feathers which characterise the others. And if the naturalist is fortunate, he may come across yet another lark, the shore lark, which will be immediately identified from its distinctive colouring by a glance at Mr. Thorburn's drawing.

The ignorance of the general public about birds is scarcely conceivable to one who has ever been in the habit of watching them. Several extraordinary instances come to mind. On one occasion, a charwoman in my employment informed me that four 'larks' had arrived for me by post. On going, in surprise, to look at them, I found two brace of grouse sent from Scotland! On another occasion, I had just arrived in the West Indies and perceiving a gaudy tropical bird sitting on a fence inquired of a local native what he called it. With an air of delight in superior knowledge, he informed me somewhat sententiously that it was a bird! Being desirous of seeing humming-birds, I shortly afterwards went into the woods; and meeting a *gentleman* who for thirty years had lived in the island, was informed by him that there were none at all in that neighbourhood. Yet within an hour or two, I found several different species—so tame and so conspicuous that a naturalist must feel it *impossible* to avoid seeing them, even if he tried. They are, perhaps, the most beautiful objects in bird life; buzzing about more like insects than birds; travelling from one flower to another, where they remain poised in the air thrusting their long bills into the flower to obtain the nectar. Meanwhile their wings move too rapidly to be seen, and give rise to the humming sound from which their name is derived. One of the most remarkable features of the humming-bird is its intense and

incessant activity ; and it is probably for this reason, rather than from any difficulty of climate or diet, that they are almost impossible to keep in captivity.

Although we have in England no humming-birds, we have at least a fine imitation in the kingfisher, figured in a very characteristic attitude in the ' Naturalist's Sketch Book.' This beautiful bird often hovers over the water in humming-bird fashion, the wings moving too fast to be seen, while the bird remains stationary until by a sudden dart it captures a fish beneath—one of the most fascinating sights of a quiet woodland stream.

The titmice are well represented, as they should be, in Mr. Thorburn's works. In ' British Birds,' the seven British species are included on a single plate—one of the most attractive of any. In the ' Naturalist's Sketch Book ' are pencil sketches of five species, in which the normal vivacity and movement of these birds is admirably suggested. The marsh titmouse is again figured side by side with the willow titmouse in a supplementary plate to ' British Birds.' Until recently, no distinction was recognised between these two birds, whose appearance indeed is almost identical. But latterly, minute distinctions have been discovered, and one race, of what used to be called the marsh titmouse, is now called the willow titmouse. It would be hopeless to try and discriminate between these two birds with the field-glasses ; their notes also are nearly identical, though I venture to suggest not quite. Before I knew of the distinction which had been drawn between the two, I had often noticed a difference in the note of the Scottish bird and that of many similar birds in England. The Scottish bird (properly, the willow titmouse) has a fuller and more convinced note. After becoming accustomed to it, the note of the English marsh titmouse sounds relatively weak and different in *timbre*; sometimes sufficiently marked to demand verification with the glasses, as to whether it really is the marsh titmouse which one knows. All the other British titmice are immediately distinguishable by their notes, as well as by their appearance. The coal titmouse can always be identified by a large spot of white on the back of his neck ; and distinction of the note soon follows that of the appearance. The long-tailed titmouse is one of those seen least often in recent years, having suffered very severely from the

cold in the spring of 1917. The bearded titmouse is limited to certain parts of Norfolk, and also (according to the 'Naturalist's Sketch Book') of Devonshire. Its note is like the ringing of a small bell, and its flight suggests a miniature pheasant. Not only on account of its rarity, but of its sound and appearance, it is one of the most delightful of British birds, especially when seen clinging among the reeds of a Norfolk Broad on a hard winter's day.

The season of winter is in many respects the most suitable for bird observation. The absence of foliage from the trees makes them easy to see; and they are not so intent upon concealment as is usually the case during the breeding season. Throughout the winter months, flocks of titmice range through the fir woods, accompanied by golden-crested wrens and tree creepers Golden-crested wrens, the smallest of British birds, are often missed in a locality, owing to their note being pitched in so high a key that for many ears it is altogether inaudible. For those not thus disqualified, their presence is soon indicated. The observer is strolling through a wood, when suddenly he becomes aware of a shrill, soft piping all round him, seeming to come from nowhere in particular. On standing still to look for the cause of the sound, he gradually becomes conscious of a party of the minutest of birds, moving with incredible vivacity and restlessness in one or more fir trees close at hand. If the observer stands quite still for some minutes, he is likely to get a good view, and may probably have a fleeting glance of a golden crest now and again, as a bird lowers its head in his direction. The party is often accompanied by long-tailed and other titmice, and forms one of the most pleasant diversions to be met with in the winter in the country. Creepers sometimes join the party—walking carefully up the bole of a tree, supporting themselves by their tails, and having got high enough up, flying down again to the bottom of another tree, and walking up that. Yet in the breeding season, one may walk through these same woods without hearing a sound of a titmouse; they are too busy, and too much intent upon concealment.

Towards the end of the winter is the very best time to see birds. They are indeed sadly reduced in number from what they were six months previously; but those that remain are in full breeding plumage, and often unusually bold. At this time

one may often see the lesser spotted woodpecker, whose head is of so brilliant and glossy a scarlet, that even Mr. Thorburn has scarcely done it justice. At times, too, one may *see* it making its loud rattling note, without however being much wiser as to how it is done, for the whole head moves with so rapid a vibration as to defy observation. It is usually (perhaps always) executed against the trunk of a tree; the curious rattle which results is confused in many text-books with that of the great spotted woodpecker, which is far less frequently heard. This season is also the most favourable for watching the green woodpecker, which comes out to feed near the edges of woods in a gorgeous plumage of scarlet and green.

Although the number of different species is smaller in winter than in summer, the birds, as already remarked, are far more easily seen; and there are a certain number which come to this country only during the winter. These include especially the two thrushes—the fieldfare and the redwing—shy birds, whose points of difference from our home thrushes are admirably brought out in Mr. Thorburn's plates. The call of the fieldfare soon comes to be as closely associated with frost and snow as the cooing of the turtle-dove is with the dense foliage and heat of a summer afternoon. These associations of birds' notes with places and seasons form one of the most attractive features of bird study; and it is partly this that accounts for the hideous vulgarity and abomination of a cuckoo clock. The four common British thrushes are easily confused at first by a beginner; but after a little time, they come to appear so different that it is hard to understand how one can ever have mistaken them. The mistle thrush differs from the song thrush in size, in colour, in flight, in note, and in having its outer tail feathers white. The redwing has a white streak over the eye, and red on the wings. Like the fieldfare it goes in flocks, but is entirely different from the fieldfare in sound and appearance. These distinctions are as plain as Nature in Mr. Thorburn's drawings, far plainer even than in stuffed specimens. Indeed, the most perfect collection of stuffed birds, such as that in the Natural History Museum, is so utterly different from the living and wild reality, that the field naturalist may even have some difficulty in recognising them. All the gloss has vanished, the contrast of colours is destroyed, and the resulting impression is that of looking at *dead* things

through a dense fog which obliterates all vitality, and reduces the intensity of coloration by a universal admixture of dull brown. The only other thrush likely to be seen is the ring ouzel in suitable places and seasons; and then there is the blackbird. It is always worth while to direct one's glasses towards a place from which the blackbird's note is heard; for on rare occasions they will disclose, not the anticipated black singer, but another bird of precisely the same size and form, but snowy white all over—an albino blackbird. The wild song of the mistle thrush is usually the first intimation of approaching spring. It is not till later that innumerable song thrushes fill the air with sound—their song being often sufficiently variable for the naturalist to recognise with ease one individual from another.

The month of March is always interesting to the ornithologist; and towards the end it becomes exciting. For one day he will be walking out as usual, and he will suddenly see a bird fly up near by, whose body appears to end in conspicuous white. Plainly not a bullfinch, it is a wheatear, the earliest spring arrival to be seen. Or, without seeing anything, he will hear from the top of a high tree a note resembling two taps of a small and resonant hammer; and though he may not be able to see the bird, he will know that the chiff-chaff has arrived, and that spring has at last begun. Confirmation soon comes in. A few days later, the familiar song of the willow warbler begins to resound through every copse in the country; and later still, the shivering note of the wood warbler is distinguished in the general chorus. These three birds—the chiff-chaff, willow warbler, and wood warbler—are so alike as usually not to be distinguishable through field-glasses. Their resemblances, and also their differences, are most skilfully brought out by Mr. Thorburn; but as a rule the chiff-chaff (except directly after arrival) and the wood warbler are not seen sufficiently near to detect the slight differences of plumage. Their notes, however, which are by far their most conspicuous part, are altogether different. Between the song of the willow warbler and that of the wood warbler, there is indeed a first-cousin relationship. But the former runs down the scale in regular time; the latter retains the same note in rapidly increasing time, so that the song ends in a sort of shiver, in which the bird's whole body participates.

It is unfortunate that Mr. Thorburn adheres to the names

of willow wren and wood wren for these birds. For they are not wrens, but warblers; and the name of warbler is at least as elegant as that of wren. It is true that Gilbert White, who first differentiated them, called them the greater, middle, and least willow wrens; but there seems no reason why an early scientific terminology should be retained, after it is known to be erroneous. The case is different from that of the hedge sparrow and golden-crested wren, the former of which is in reality an accentor, and the latter a regulus. Since neither of these names is good English, there is an excellent reason for preserving their usual names. The argument cannot, however, be held to apply where there *is* a good English name, which is also accurate.

In general, the warblers have no bright colours to facilitate their distinction, and notwithstanding their wide variety of notes, many of them remained undistinguished till well on in the last century. Bewick, for instance, makes no reference to the garden warbler (unless it is what he calls the greater fauvette), nor to the lesser whitethroat, nor to the reed warbler or marsh warbler. In fact, it is comparatively recently that these last two were distinguished from each other, and from the sedge warbler, called by Bewick the reed fauvette. Yet in most cases their song is entirely distinctive. It is true that at the beginning of the season a garden warbler often sounds very like a blackcap, and a glance at the head is desirable to make sure of the difference. But the song of the lesser whitethroat could not very well be mistaken for anything else. It has indeed two kinds of song, so entirely different that ocular demonstration is necessary to show that they are produced by the same bird. The reed warbler and sedge warbler are likewise as easy to distinguish as the willow warbler from the wood warbler. It is perhaps natural that Bewick should not have known of the grasshopper warbler, for the bird is extremely difficult to see, and its note might very well be taken for that of a grasshopper.

Much easier to see, and often found in the same neighbourhood, is the Dartford warbler, one of Mr. Thorburn's striking successes. More conspicuously coloured than most warblers, it remains with us all the year round in the few districts which it frequents. In behaviour and in song, particularly in its alarm note, it much resembles the whitethroat, but is more skulking and more inquisitive. If the observer will remain perfectly still

under a furze bush where Dartford warblers are about, they are very apt to come so close as to be almost within arm's length. In England they are unfortunately rare; in the south of Spain the present writer has observed them in great abundance. Few of the smaller birds are so attractive.

Mr. Thorburn has been particularly happy in his delineation of the starling, which is presented, in colour, in 'British Birds,' and in a pencil sketch, in the 'Naturalist's Sketch Book.' One of the commonest, most interesting, and most beautiful of British birds, it often deceives the naturalist by its remarkable powers of imitation. It is particularly good with the autumn note of the willow warbler. On the same plate, in the 'Naturalist's Sketch Book,' is an admirable drawing of the nightjar, sitting in its usual curious way lengthwise on a branch. Its loud churring note rises and falls in such a way as to make the bird seem sometimes near, sometimes far off. One of the nightingale's most distinctive notes has the same sort of far-away suggestion.

The arrangement of similar birds on one plate is nowhere more effective than in the case of the owls; and very singular they are. Only a few years ago no one could expect to see more than four species of owl in this country. The long-eared owl is occasionally met with in fir woods in daytime. It then sits upon a branch, with its long ears fully erected, staring at the intruder with a most ludicrous air of indescribable astonishment. Fixing its large eyes intently upon him, it stretches its neck to right and left in the apparent endeavour to get a better view of so amazing an object. The short-eared owl is often seen flying over the fields in daytime. The tawny owl and the barn owl are essentially night birds. The former is the author of the well-known hoot, designed to terrify the mice below. It has latterly become common, even in London; and in the small hours of the night, when all vehicles have disappeared from the streets, the silence of Piccadilly is broken only by the hoot of the tawny owl as he works his beat over Green Park.

> 'Then nightly sings the staring owl,
> To-whit, to-whoo, a merry note.'

Until recently, these four owls were all that were ordinarily met with in England; but in the last few years the little owl

has been introduced from the Continent, and become in some localities exceedingly abundant. Unfortunately, it is very destructive of smaller birds, and this artificial readjustment of the balance of bird life may turn out to have very regrettable consequences. One or two of the rarer owls are given in the 'Naturalist's Sketch Book,' as well as several fine studies of the barn owl.

The cessation of game-preserving during the war has led to a great increase in birds usually shot by gamekeepers. The kestrel is more numerous than it has ever been, and jays likewise have become very abundant. The harsh cry of the latter resounds through many of the woods round London, and is silenced only in the breeding season, unless by chance one happens to flush the female bird on her nest full of eggs almost indistinguishable from the blackbird's. Bird protection, on the other hand, has notably increased the numbers of many small birds, such as the goldfinch and the bearded titmouse. The bittern, at one time practically extinct, is now again upon the increase. The hoopoe is another bird which might well become common, but for its exceeding tameness and conspicuous appearance, which cause almost universal persecution. On one occasion the present writer followed them for miles over the plains of Morocco, unable to desist from so fascinating a pursuit, until at length he found himself totally lost in a prairie of gorgeous flowers stretching away on every side to the horizon. To be lost in this wide expanse of bright colour, and in the society of hoopoes, what more exhilarating experience can there be?

Mr. Thorburn's pencil sketches lend themselves so admirably to the portrayal of *motion* in natural history that there are some incidents which we cannot but regret he has omitted. Such, for instance, is the spectacle of the young cuckoo, being fed by its foster-mother—a titlark perhaps,—perched on its shoulders and thrusting its whole head and beak, holding some morsel of food, into the wide mouth of the cuckoo, which turns its head round to receive it. Another curious spectacle which the present writer witnessed one hot summer afternoon was that of a cuckoo laying an egg, to the excessive alarm of a number of reed buntings which were nesting close by. A sketch might also have been included of the dunlin running; for no portrait of a

resting dunlin can give any idea of the fascination of this vivacious bird.

The gannet receives due attention in both Mr. Thorburn's works. These most interesting of sea birds have a few breeding colonies in Great Britain, where they crowd together in fabulous numbers on ledges of rock on steep cliffs. In the middle of August last, the present writer, perceiving a gannet's egg half way down such a cliff, made a perilous though successful descent to secure it. As he climbed from ledge to ledge, he was attacked by young gannets in all stages of growth, for they and their nests were so thickly clustered that it required care to avoid treading on them. Since both hands and feet were engaged in holding on, he was at some disadvantage in the combat. Although this particular egg was addled, the number of new-born chicks was sufficient to indicate that the gannet breeds more than once during the summer. They circle high over the sea in quest of food; and on seeing fish below, there is a slight flutter of the wings, followed by a dead drop, beak foremost into the sea. The speed with which they splash into the water sends a high fountain into the air, and leaves the most agile fish not a chance of escaping. These birds follow south-bound ocean steamers nearly to the line of the tropics.

The amateur naturalist, who is not interested in what the text-books say, but only in what he can see for himself, will probably be led into occasional scientific heresies where his own observation does not bear out the conclusions of others. Such, for instance, may be the case with the well-known drumming of the snipe in spring. The orthodox view, adopted by the Zoological Society as the result of an experiment, is that this sound is produced by the air rushing through the feathers of the *tail* during downward flight. The wings are in such rapid motion that it is unquestionably impossible to tell, by direct observation, whether the sound is produced by them or by the tail. It does not seem, however, to have been noticed, that a little later in the year, peewits often emit a sound of obviously similar character. As with snipe, this sound occurs only in downward flight, and further only at each downward stroke of the wings. The wings of the peewit move comparatively so slowly that the sound is discontinuous, broken by each upward flap of the wings. With the rapid wing movement of the snipe,

it would in any case appear continuous. Experiment notwithstanding, some doubt must remain as to whether a sound, plainly produced by the peewit with its wings, may not after all be produced by the snipe in the same way.

At all seasons of the year, and in all countries of the world, natural history adds a new and fiery interest to life, which is always greater if it is purely amateur, pursued without ulterior aim and for the pleasure of the thing alone. It is a hobby free from the spirit of rivalry or hostility, which takes the worker of the town away into the country into the best surroundings of health, beauty, and music, while diverting his mind from all ordinary tasks. And if he persists in being an amateur rather than scientific, the desire for knowledge will always remain subordinate to the pleasures of seeing and hearing. Some places he will always remember for the corn buntings, whose scraping notes never seemed to cease; others for the cirl bunting, or the bearded titmouse, or the Dartford warbler. In fact, it becomes almost an axiom that you cannot take a walk in *any* part of the country without seeing something sufficiently unusual to mark the day. And, of course, the pleasures of travel are immensely enhanced, while we forget the beaten track of tourists. We are sitting in a cemetery at Paris, when suddenly a redstart perches on a tomb close at hand—a small thing, but the cemetery appears less gloomy afterwards. Or we are sitting in a church listening to a sermon, when suddenly our feelings are echoed by a greenfinch outside delivering himself of a loud yawn. The harsh notes of the gaudy tropical birds become musical. Even the horrors of scorpions and centipedes are converted into enthusiasm.

The present writer once made a collection of giant centipedes in the island of Dominica—the most awe-inspiring creatures he has ever met with. Taking them on board a small coasting vessel, he fed them for some time on cockroaches, which that vessel produced in abundance; but presently they fell to cannibalism, until only one was left. Two, however, succeeded in escaping on board — a circumstance which he carefully refrained from mentioning, having already been requested by the captain to throw overboard a tarantula which he had also secured. On going late into his cabin one night, he beheld one of the escaped centipedes, nearly a foot long, crawling over the

floor; and thereafter his rest was somewhat disturbed, though by general consent he always had a cabin to himself. Scorpions are not nearly so alarming to look at, though actually more dangerous.

But if the naturalist finds everywhere, in all times and places, a new zest and spice in life, he also has regrets. The voices of the curlew or redshank or oyster-catcher mean more to him than other people; but they also suggest what a paradise the country must have been before the drainage of the fens, and when wide marshes covered various parts of England. It is not only the booming of the bittern and the piping of the waders that he misses; it is not birds only, but the wildness, and also weird effects like that of the will-o'-the-wisp, which used to bob over the marshes at night, leading the traveller further and further astray. This hopeless pursuit of a goal, never to be reached, seems to typify so much in human philosophy. The will-o'-the-wisp is extinct in England now; high roads traverse its ancient habitats. Yet with all its pitfalls and dangers, it must have been amazingly attractive to follow. For after all, it tends to be true that pleasure is in pursuit, *ennui* in attainment.

'Security is mortal's chiefest enemy.'

And for the security afforded by civilisation, we have no doubt to pay the price.

HUGH ELLIOT.

AN EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY CLERIC-SCIENTIST

1. **The Magdalen Hospital: The Story of a Great Charity.** By the Rev. H. F. B. COMPSTON. 1917.
2. **Eighteenth-Century Fires in Cornhill:** *Notes and Queries*, 9th December 1916.
3. **The History of the Royal Society of Arts.** By SIR HENRY TRUEMAN WOOD. 1913.
4. **Dictionary of National Biography.** Article: 'Stephen Hales.'

MR. COMPSTON, in his story of the Magdalen Hospital, remarks that 'the eighteenth century was a period of social 'reform and charitable enterprise. . . The work of the 'devout and large-hearted layman . . is a conspicuous feature of 'the period. The clergy displayed little or no initiative in such 'work. They were too often in a state of sleepiness and 'subservience.'

It may somewhat mollify this perfectly just stricture to consider some of the achievements of a parish priest who made researches of capital importance in pneumatic chemistry, and in animal and vegetable physiology; who effected improved ventilation for prisons, hospitals, and ships of war; who, for humanitarian ends, laid vivisection under contribution; who rendered active assistance in establishing the colony of Georgia; who was foremost in founding the Society of Arts; who waged war against gin drinking; who was a pioneer in the study of vital statistics; and who demonstrated the mechanism of earthquakes in the hope that Nature's *modus operandi* might be better understood by the bewildered Londoner of 1750.

At Teddington, by the Thames, stands an old and diminutive three-gabled brick church—now disused—with red tiled roof and squat ivy-clad tower, within whose precincts are buried two remarkable inhabitants, who died within a year of each other. In 1760, when but thirty-nine, was laid to rest Miss Margaret Woffington, whose histrionic graces are part of eighteenth-century stage-history, whose lineaments of mortal beauty attracted Hogarth's brush at least thrice, whose 'gay airs' were

celebrated by Fielding; whose personal charms captivated men no less gifted than Garrick, Edmund Burke, and Sir Charles Hanbury Williams, and—perhaps most noteworthy—drew from a rival, Mrs Bellamy, the admission that she was 'the enchantress 'of all hearts.' In January 1761 was interred the church's incumbent of upwards of half-a-century, the Rev. Stephen Hales, who, like Abraham, 'died in a good old age,' nigh eighty-four years. It is the purpose of the following sketch to show that this original, self-poised, and versatile minister, who, we may hope, brought all the comfort he could to the bed-ridden actress resident three years at Udney Hall within his cure, deserves also a place in the annals of his country.

Though so long linked to Teddington, Hale's experiences were by no means confined to it. In 1696, when eighteen, he had been sent by his father—Sir Thomas Hales, of Bekesbourne, near Canterbury, whose sixth son he was, to Corpus Christi, Cambridge, where he took his degree in 1699.

There entered at Corpus, shortly after Hales became a Fellow, in 1703, no less a person than William Stukely, the noted antiquary, eventually an M.D., and Fellow of the College of Physicians. The young men coalesced, and, actuated by kindred tastes, they together rambled over the Gogmagog Hills, and the bogs of Cherry-Hinton Moor. They gathered botanical specimens, collected fossils in the chalkpits, and minerals from the gravels, afterwards extending their investigations from the superficial structure of natural objects to the more hidden truths of anatomy, by dissecting frogs and other animals. From frogs they passed to dogs, and Hales' method of obtaining a facsimile of a dog's lungs in lead displays the genuine traits of the inborn experimenter. They then applied themselves to chemistry. They repeated many of Boyle's experiments—still classics—and attended the lectures given in Queens' College Cloisters by Vigani, the first professor of Chemistry at Cambridge. They also witnessed chemical operations, conducted by Vigani, in a room in Trinity College, 'which had been the laboratory of Sir 'Isaac Newton, and in which, unfortunately for the world, Sir 'Isaac's manuscript concerning chemical principles was acci-'dentally burnt.' From chemistry Hales passed to astronomy, the principles of which he so well mastered as to enable him to design an apparatus representing the motions of the planets.

In 1710 Hales was presented to the perpetual cure of Teddington, and he became a Bachelor of Divinity in 1711. Those were the days of pluralists, and in 1717 he also received the benefice of Porlock, in Somersetshire, and by accepting it vacated his College Fellowship.* The Porlock living he held until 1723, but the church registers afford no evidence that he ever visited this West of England village, so famed for its scenery, 'lying ensconced in a deep amphitheatre of foliage,' and opening to the sea.

In 1719 Hales detailed a series of experiments to the Royal Society (of which he had become a Fellow the year before), on the effect of the sun's warmth in raising the sap in trees. The Society urged him to prosecute his inquiries.

Meanwhile, in 1723, he had exchanged the living of Porlock for that of Farringdon, in Hampshire, situated three miles south of Alton. That he regularly visited this village is clear, for the celebrated Gilbert White, the last curate-in-charge appointed by Hales, wrote to Robert Marsham, Esq., of Stratton Strawless, in Norfolk, in 1790:—

'The late Dr. Stephen Hales was my most valuable friend, and in former days near neighbour during the summer months. For though his usual abode was at Teddington, yet he did for many years reside for about two months at his rectory at Farringdon, and was well known to my grandfather and father, as well as myself.'

Encouraged by the Royal Society, and no less by the vista his investigations had opened out, Hales pursued his experiments, and in 1727 published his 'Vegetable Statics.' The work is dedicated to the Prince of Wales, who, a few months later, became George II. He was immediately elected to the Council of the Society on the occasion, as it happened, that Sir Hans Sloane first occupied the presidential chair vacated by the death of Newton.

A second edition of the 'Vegetable Statics' appeared in 1731, and in the preface a sequel was promised. This Hales published in 1733, under the title, 'Hæmastatics: or an account 'of some hydraulic hydrostatical experiments made on the 'blood and blood vessels of animals.'

* Legally, the holding of one living, and one perpetual curacy, did not constitute pluralism; consequently Hales never had to obtain a dispensation from the Archbishop, as I am informed by the Rev. C. Jenkins, librarian at Lambeth Palace.

Instead of attempting an independent epitome of the 'Vegetable Statics' and of the 'Hæmastatics,' we reproduce the opinions of two men of science far better qualified to estimate them. Of Hales' botanical work, Julius von Sachs tells us:—

'All the work done from Malpighi and Mariotte to Ingenhousz, to advance the knowledge of the nutrition of plants, was thrown into the shade by the brilliant investigations of Stephen Hales, in whom we see the genius of discovery, and the sound original reasoning powers of the great explorers of nature in Newton's age. His *Statical Essays* was devoted to a more complete account of the nutrition of plants and of the movements of sap in them. It was chiefly composed of the author's own investigations. An abundance of new experiments and observations, measurements and calculations, combine to form a living picture of the whole subject. . . . Hales may be said to have made his plants themselves speak; by means of cleverly contrived and skilfully managed experiments, he compelled them to disclose the forces that were at work in them by effects made apparent to the eye, and thus to show that forces of a very peculiar kind are in constant activity in the quiet and apparently passive organs of vegetation. . . . His investigations into transpiration and the movement of water in the wood were greeted with the warmest approbation. He measured the quantity of water sucked in by the roots and given off by the leaves, compared this with the supply of moisture contained in the earth, and endeavoured to calculate the rapidity with which the water rises in the stem, and to compare it with the rapidity of its entrance into the roots and its exit by the leaves. The experiments, by which he showed the force of suction in wood and roots and that of the root-pressure in the case of the bleeding vine, were particularly striking and instructive. . . . He was the first who proved that air co-operates in the building up the body of the plant, in the formation of its solid substance, and that gaseous constituents contribute largely to the nourishment of the plant; consequently that neither water, nor the substances which it carries with it from the earth, alone supply the material of which plants are composed, as had been generally imagined. If we compare what was known before Malpighi's time with the contents of Hales' book, we shall be astonished at the rapid advance made in less than sixty years, while scarcely anything had been contributed to the subject in the period between Aristotle and Malpighi.'

Turning to Hales' researches in physiology with which the 'Hæmastatics' is occupied, the late Sir Michael Foster, Professor of Physiology at Cambridge, wrote as follows:—

'Hales not only exactly measured the amount of blood pressure under varying circumstances, the capacity of the heart, the diameter of the blood vessels and the like, and from his several data made his calculations and drew his conclusions, but also, by an ingenious

method,* he measured the rate of the flow of blood in the capillaries in the abdominal muscles and lungs of a frog. He knew how to keep blood fluid with saline solutions, studied the form of muscles at rest and in contraction, and speculated that what we now call a nervous impulse, but which was then spoken of as the animal spirits, might possibly be an electric change. And though he accepted the current view that the heat of the body was produced by the friction of the blood in the capillaries, he was not wholly content with this, but speaks of the mutually vibrating action of fluids and solids in a way that makes us feel that, had the chemistry of the time been as advanced as were the physics, many weary years of error and ignorance might have been saved.'

In 1732 Hales was appointed one of the trustees for establishing a new colony in Georgia, and among his coadjutors were James (afterwards Admiral) Vernon, Thomas Coram, a 'devout 'and large-hearted' mariner, who was possibly already revolving in his mind a hospital for foundlings, and James (afterwards General) Oglethorpe, whom Mr. Austin Dobson regards as 'a 'Paladin of Philanthropy.' The trustees had power to appoint Commissioners, among whom figure Viscount Tyrconnel, of Arlington Street; Sir Hans Sloane, Bart., of Bloomsbury Square; and Sir John Gonson, of the Temple, whose face is so well known as that of the 'raiding justice,' in the third plate of Hogarth's 'Harlot's Progress.'

After the publication of his 'Hæmastatics,' Hales, repelled by the disagreeablenesses of anatomical pursuits, temporarily suspended his researches, and turned his attention to a pressing social evil. Says the historian, J. R. Green, of this period: 'The 'introduction of gin gave a new impetus to drunkenness. In 'the streets of London, at one time, gin shops invited every passer-'by to get drunk for a penny, or dead drunk for twopence.' Hales, seriously exercised by the subversion of the health and moral well-being of the lower and middle classes by these excesses, put forth, in 1734, 'A Friendly Admonition to the 'Drinkers of Brandy and other Distilled Spirits.' The tractate met with much favour, and a sixth edition appeared as late as 1807.† In 1736 he contributed the yet more important 'Dis-

* 'Hales' piezometer' is still an instrument of precision (see Dorland's 'American Illustrated Medical Dictionary.' Philadelphia. 1917).

† A perusal of it makes it clear that Hales did not advocate total abstinence; he appears, in fact, to have had no objection to the consumption of pure wines containing moderate quantities of alcohol.

'tilled Spirituous Liquors the Bane of the Nation.' Let us hear what his great contemporary, Henry Fielding, with a first-hand knowledge of the results of this depravity, wrote of Hales, in 1751, when, as Bow Street magistrate, he urged the Legislature to enact some measure of prohibition :—

'A new kind of drunkenness is lately sprung up amongst us,* which, if not put a stop to, will infallibly destroy a great part of the inferior people. The drunkenness I here intend is that acquired by that poison called *gin*, which I have great reason to think is the principal sustenance (if it may be so called) of more than a hundred thousand people in this metropolis. Many of these wretches there are who swallow pints of this poison within the twenty-four hours, the dreadful effects of which I have the misfortune every day to see, and to smell, too. . . . Wretches are often brought before me, charged with theft and robbery, whom I am forced to confine, before they are in a condition to be examined; and when they have afterwards become sober, I have plainly perceived, from the state of the case, that the gin alone was the cause of the transgression, and have been sometimes sorry that I was obliged to commit them to prison. . . . For the ill effects which such poisonous liquors produce in the constitution, I refer the reader to "The Physical Account of the Nature of all Distilled Spirituous Liquors, and the Effect they have on Human Bodies," which was composed by a very learned divine, with the assistance of several physicians, and published in the year 1736. The title is, "Distilled Spirituous Liquors the Bane of the Nation." And though, perhaps, the consequence of this poison, as it operates slowly, may not so visibly appear in the diminution of the strength, health, and lives of the present generation; yet let a man cast his eyes but a moment towards our posterity, and there the dreadful consequences must strike on the meanest capacity. . . . What must become of the infant who is conceived in gin? with the poisonous distillations of which it is nourished, both in the womb, and at the breast. Are these wretched infants (if such can be supposed capable of arriving at the age of maturity) to become our future sailors, and our future grenadiers? Is it by the labour of such as these that all the emoluments of peace are to be procured us, and all the dangers of war averted from us? . . . Doth not this polluted source, instead of producing servants for the husbandman or artificer, instead of providing recruits for the sea or the field, promise only to fill almshouses and hospitals, and to infect the streets with stench and diseases?' †

* Caused, says Mr. Walter Sichel, by tabooing French imports. 'The duties on French wines were £33 a tun heavier than on Portuguese and Spanish under the Methuen Treaty. Brandy and rum, as well as claret, became articles of luxury, and the Whigs are responsible for the degradation of a whole people by gin.' 'Bolingbroke and his Times,' vol. i., p. 131.

† 'An Enquiry into the Causes of the late Increase of Robbers,' section 2.

A month later, in February 1751, Hogarth published his plate, *Gin Lane*, designedly produced at so low a price as to be within the means of all. Forced thus into action, Parliament, in the June following, passed a Bill 'For Restricting the Sale of 'Spirituous Liquors,' and some of its provisions are in force to this day.

When Hales returned to experimental work, he applied his mechanical ingenuity to practical problems, and in 1739 produced a volume entitled, 'Philosophical Experiments on Sea Water, 'Corn, Flesh, and other Substances.' It contained many useful instructions to voyagers, and was dedicated to the Lords of the Admiralty. In the same year he described to the Royal Society experiments towards the discovery of solvents for stone in the kidney and bladder, and also a further set of experiments for preserving meat in long voyages, and for these he received the Copley medal. In 1740 he published a long series of experiments, designed to test the efficiency of certain medicines for dissolving stone, put upon the market by a certain Mrs. Stephen. What strikes the reader most in these papers, next to the precision of his experimental methods, is Hales' clarity of vision in perceiving where science ends and art begins. He details his experiments with exactitude, and draws inferences where permissible ; but he is always insistent that the applicability of his methods to the art of healing is to be decided by medical practitioners, and invariably declines to trespass on their functions. There was nothing of the quack about Hales.

Pope, in moving from Chiswick to Twickenham in 1718, settled for life within a mile or so of Hales' residence. The poet, who counselled

> 'First follow Nature, and your judgment frame,
> By her just standard which is still the same,'*

would have much in common with the cleric-physiologist who clearly perceived that

'The wonderful and secret operations of Nature are so involved and intricate, so far out of the reach of our senses, as they present themselves to us in their natural order, that it is impossible for the most sagacious and penetrating genius to pry into them, unless he will be at the pains of analysing Nature by a numerous and regular series of experiments, which are the only solid foundation whence

* 'Essay on Criticism,' ll. 68 and 69.

we may reasonably expect to make any advance in the real knowledge of the nature of things.' *

Hales could follow the growth of Pope's gardens with a skilled eye, and tell the nature of the minerals sent to furnish the grotto by Dr. Borlase, vicar of Ludgvan, near Penzance, to whom Pope gracefully wrote that 'the Cornish diamonds,† 'like their donor, were in the shade, but shining.' Joseph Spence records Pope's sincere regard for Hales—with one reservation—and reproduces the poet's own words :—

'"I shall be very glad to see Dr. Hales, and always love to see him, he is so worthy and good a man. Yes, he is a very good man, only I'm sorry he has his hands so much imbrued in blood." "What, he cuts up rats?" inquired Spence. "Ay! and dogs, too! (with what emphasis and concern he spoke it). Indeed, he commits most of these barbarities with the thought of being of use to man. But how do we know that we have a right to kill creatures that we are so little above as dogs, for our curiosity, or even for some use to us?"' ‡

Though Pope, in the interests of brute creation, thus discountenanced vivisection, he realised that its practice in no way blunted Hales' humanity.

'From peer or bishop 'tis no easy thing
To draw the man who loves his God, or King;
Alas! I copy (or my draught would fail)
From honest Mah'met, or plain Parson Hale.'
['Moral Essays,' Epistle 2, ll. 195-198].

Poetic licence demanded the curtailment in the last word, but the panegyric is of a high order, and the illustration not inapt. Though they had sworn allegiance to His Majesty, many of the nobility ranged themselves into a St. James's and a Leicester House faction, and the King's most devoted subject was his Turkish Page of the Backstairs, who died in 1726, after forty years' trusted service. In like manner undeviating piety and a Christian altruism were more conspicuous in the Teddington parsonage than in Episcopal palaces.§

---

* Preface to 'Vegetable Statics.'

† *i.e.*, quartz crystals.

‡ Hales' experiments on living animals appear to have been invariably made either on horses that were beyond work, or dogs suffering from disease.

§ 'I do not, by the flourishing estate of the Church, understand the palaces, equipages, dress, furniture, rich dainties, and vast fortunes of her ministers.' Parson Adams, in 'Joseph Andrews,' i. 17.

On 12th December 1743 Hales was a witness to Pope's will, the other two witnesses being the Earl of Radnor, Pope's neighbour, whose house and grounds are now the property of the Twickenham Urban District Council, and Spence, who, next to his veneration for Pope, is best known as having saved Horace Walpole's life in Italy in 1741.

But Hales was not dependent upon Pope for friends. We learn that 'for several years he was honoured with the esteem 'and friendship of Frederick, Prince of Wales, who frequently 'visited him at Teddington, from his neighbouring palace at 'Kew, and took a pleasure in surprising him in the midst of 'those curious researches which almost incessantly employed 'him.'

Hales, it is said, established a custom of making those of his female parishioners who had transgressed do penance in church. This is the least amiable trait recorded of him, and occasions regret that he did not permit himself the guidance of Matthew Prior:—

> 'Be to her virtues very kind:
> Be to her faults a little blind;
> Let all her ways be unconfin'd,
> And clap your padlock—on her mind.'

Consequently, it is pleasing to find Laetitia Pilkington (of happy wit, but of beauty less fortunate) writing to Richardson, in 1745, that she is being strongly recommended to the Lord Almoner for the King's bounty by His Grace of York and by Dr. Hales.

In 1741 Hales described to the Royal Society a mechanism, which he called ventilators, for conveying fresh air into mines, hospitals, prisons, and close places on board ship. In 1749 these ventilators were erected in the Savoy prison, on the instructions of Henry Fox, then Secretary of War. Previous to their introduction, the average mortality from jail distemper was seventy-five persons a year, but from 1749 to 1752 no more than four persons died, though the number of prisoners in 1750 was 240. In 1752 the ventilators, worked by a windmill, were set up in Newgate prison. The next year Hales described the manner in which the ventilators could be adapted to drawing foul air from the sick rooms of military hospitals. In a letter to Dr. Swithin Adee, of Oxford, dated in 1757, Hales expressed his pleasure that, after considerable pressure, he had succeeded in causing the same means to be adopted for securing the

health of English prisoners in France as had been practised for nearly two years to the great benefit of French prisoners in England. 'On which occasion,' says the Rev. Weedon Butler, 'the venerable patriarch of Teddington was heard 'merrily to say he hoped nobody would inform against him for 'corresponding with the enemy.'

The utility of the ventilators is certified by Captain Thomson, of the 'Success' frigate, who, writing to Hales from London in 1749, says :—

'. . . . We all agreed that the ventilators were of great service, the men being so sensible of the benefit of them that they required *no driving* to work that which they received so much benefit by. We found this good effect from ventilation, that though there were near 200 men on board for almost a year, yet I landed them all well in Georgia, notwithstanding they were pressed men, and delivered me out of jails with distempers upon them. This is what I believe but few transports, or any other ships, can brag of; nor did I ever meet the like good luck before. It is to be remarked that we who lay wind bound for four months, with our Expedition Fleet, which soon after invaded France, were very healthy all the time, when they were very sick in all the ships of that expedition.'

The testimony of Henry Ellis, dating from Bristol in 1753, is to the same effect :—

'The ventilators of your invention which I had were of singular service to us; they kept the inside of the ship cool, sweet, dry, and healthy. The number of slaves I buried was only six, and not one white man of our crew (which was thirty-four) during a voyage of fifteen months; an instance very uncommon. The 340 negroes were very sensible of the benefits of a constant ventilation, and were always displeased when it was omitted.'

A passage in Hales' treatise on 'Ventilation' may be quoted, though the precise evil has seldom to be combated now. As 'Infant Welfare' has passed into the domain of practical politics Hales' warning will be appreciated.

'I cannot dismiss the subject of free air without saying something for those who cannot speak for themselves. I mean young tender infants who are often swathed up in such a manner as must needs greatly incommode their breathing, and consequently be very hurtful to them; for when their tender bodies are close confined in swathings, neither their breast nor belly can rise so freely as they ought to do, when the child draws in its breath. Consequently, not only its breathing, but digestion also, are thereby greatly incommoded; for the digestion is much promoted by the kneadings of the midriff on the stomach, which are no less than twelve hundred in an hour. Those

who will not be persuaded to leave off that old, very bad practice, ought themselves to be well swathed up, to be made duly sensible of the misery they would suffer thereby in one night.'*

The Rev. Edward Young, vicar of Wellwyn, in Hertfordshire, author of 'The Complaint; or, Night Thoughts,' writing in 1746 to Samuel Richardson, printer by vocation, and author by avocation, remarks: 'I heartily rejoice that at length you find 'benefit from tar water. Tar by winter, and steel by summer, 'are the two champions to subdue the spleen.' Writing to the Duchess of Portland, a year later, he tells her Grace: 'Tar water 'is the only medicine from which I receive any manner of relief.' Yet another clergyman, Laurence Sterne, used to dose himself with tar water after all-night sittings. Wrote the dying Fielding, 'I betook myself to the Bishop Berkeley's prescription, and dosed 'myself every morning and evening with half a pint of tar 'water. . . . From the very first it lessened my illness, increased 'my appetite, and added, though in a very slow proportion, to 'my bodily strength.'

These extracts are a sufficient testimony that some persons took this medicament beneficially. Now the virtues of tar water were first advocated by Bishop Berkeley, the metaphysician whom Huxley calls 'one of the noblest and purest figures of his 'time.' In his 'Chain of Philosophical Reflections and Inquiries 'concerning Tar Water,' 1744, he set forth an account of the many cures it had achieved. Berkeley placed its claims for universal recognition unquestionably too high, yet it must have won an early popularity, for in 1744 a Tar Water Warehouse was established. It stood behind the Thatch'd House Tavern in St. James's Street.

There is, in the British Museum, a volume labelled 'Tar Water 'Tracts.' It is a collection of pamphlets, friendly and hostile, launched upon a public who, in matters of tar drinking, as in most others, took sides. This volume is an excellent example

* Readers of 'Peregrine Pickle' (published in 1751) may recollect that Tobias Smollett, M.D., writes in Chapter VI., 'No sooner was Mrs. Pickle in a condition to reassume the management of her own affairs than she thought proper to alter certain regulations concerning the child, directing that the bandages with which the infant had been so neatly rolled up, like an Egyptian mummy, should be loosened and laid aside, in order to rid nature of all restraint, and give the blood free scope to circulate.'

of Georgian polemics ; some of the writers are clever and often humorous, many are derisive ; but with a single exception, not one of these contributors, who rushed into print to enlighten the public, advanced the case, for or against tar water, one inch. But amid this clash of wit there was one who, realising as Laurence Sterne did, that 'the finest spun arguments cannot alter the essential 'nature of things,' applied himself to experiment. Hales in this tract, published in 1745, adopted the method of fractional solution. Finding that tar contained complex chemical bodies of differing solubility in water, he leached out the several constituents in accordance with their rates of solution. Expose tar to water long enough and all constituents which are not insoluble in water will pass into solution, but if the aqueous solutions are poured off, say every five, ten, or fifteen minutes, and fresh water added, then a series of liquors will be obtained which will differ very materially from each other, the first of the series containing the constituents most soluble in water, and the last those that are least soluble. Hales argued that the great discrepancies in the results of treatment by tar water were no great matter for wonder, whilst the medicament was prepared in a haphazard manner. If his methods of preparation were followed physicians would be able to prescribe tar water containing the more acid or the less acid constituents as the symptoms of their patients would indicate.

On 25th March 1748, a serious fire occurred in Cornhill ; its extent has been recently thus described in *Notes and Queries* :—

'It commenced at Eldrige's, a peruke maker in Exchange Alley. It destroyed the south side of Cornhill from where the Commercial Union now stands to St. Michael's Alley, and also all the property at the rear thereof (Exchange Alley, Birchin Lane, Castle Court, and the west side of St. Michael's Alley and George Yard), to the back of the houses of Lombard Street. The offices of the London Assurance, in Castle Court, were burnt, though most of the records appear to have been saved ; King's Insurance Office, in Change Alley, and Fletcher's and Deacon's Insurance Office, in Birchin Lane, were also burnt. Other notable properties destroyed were the Swan, Fleece, and the Three Tuns Taverns and the following famous coffee houses—Tom's, the Rainbow, Garraway's, Jonathan's, and the Jerusalem. No. 41 Cornhill, the birthplace and property of the poet Gray, were included in the conflagration.'

Hales, though safely housed in a country parsonage, was by no means indifferent to such a calamity. Shaping his course by that wise rule that it is better to be secure than sorry, he bethought

him of preventive measures against a recurrence of such disasters. In less than a month he communicated a proposal to the Royal Society for checking, in some degree, the progress of such fires. His trials were simple, and can be stated in a few words. He covered a deal board, half an inch thick, with garden earth, an inch deep, and found, upon making a fire upon it, with good fuel, and blowing the same with bellows, that it was two hours before the board was burnt through, and that it at no time broke into flame. Hence he concluded that throwing earth on the floors of houses must diminish the fierceness and retard the progress of fires, and especially did he recommend the strewing of earth on stairs, up which fires generally ascend, earth remaining in position when water runs off. It is easy for the denizens of a highly organised city, where hydraulic pressures can command edifices of twelve stories, where the rooms and stairways of public buildings are lined with grenades of compressed gases (which being non-supporters of combustion are extinguishers of flame), to smile at such rudimentary suggestions. But to appreciate the situation as Hales found it, we must bring to mind what Mr. Austin Dobson describes as 'that dark and doubtful rookery of tortuous 'streets and unnumbered houses, the London of the eighteenth 'century,' and, where no wells existed, a water supply running in conduit-pipes of hollowed tree-trunks. After all it is a proof of the utility of Hales' suggestion, that buckets of earth are to this day kept in readiness at railway stations and like places.

Horace Walpole, writing from Strawberry Hill to Sir Horace Mann, on 25th February 1750, informs him :—

'I have come hither for a little repose and air. Air in February will make you smile—yet it is strictly true, that the weather is unnaturally hot; we have had eight months of warmth beyond what was ever known in any other country. You know we have had an earthquake. Mr. Chute's "Francesco" says that a few evenings before it there was a bright cloud, which the mob called *the bloody cloud*; that he had been told there never were earthquakes in England, or else he should have known by that symptom that there would be one within a week.'

Writing again, on 11th March 1750, from Arlington Street, Walpole continues :—

'We have had a second earthquake, much more violent than the first. . . . In the night between Wednesday and Thursday last (exactly a month since the first shock), the earth had a shivering fit between

one and two. . . . I had been awake, and had scarce dozed again —on a sudden I felt my bolster lift up my head; I thought somebody was getting from under my bed, but soon found it was a strong earthquake, that lasted near half a minute, with a violent vibration and great roaring. . . . Two old houses were flung down, several chimneys, and much chinaware. The bells rang in several houses. . . . Several people are going out of town, for it has nowhere reached above ten miles from London.'

Making allowance for that treacherous exaggeration which Walpole seldom attempted to restrain—we yet perceive that Londoners had experienced a most unusual occurrence. Natural phenomena of this order would claim the attention of one of Hales' mental calibre and tastes. By way of experiment, he made *aqua fortis* (nitric acid) react on iron pyrites (the naturally occurring mundic), and the gaseous matter evolved he confined in an inverted glass jar by displacement of its previously contained water. After standing some time there was skilfully introduced into the gas so enclosed some ordinary air. At once a ruddy coloured gaseous product was formed, and Hales utilised the phenomenon towards the solution of the problem thus: 'Upon the mixture of the fresh air with the sulphureous air, 'there instantly arose a violent agitation between the two airs, 'and they became, from being transparent and clear, a reddish 'turbid fume, of the colour of these vapours which were seen 'several evenings before the late earthquake.' Those who have studied chemistry will perceive Hales to be building on false premises. Some sulphureous gas (sulphur dioxide) would be formed, but being a remarkably soluble gas it at once became dissolved in the water in which his inverted jar stood, giving to it a smell of burning sulphur which he was no doubt quick enough to detect, but by which he was misled. For the gas which remained undissolved was essentially different: it was what is now called nitric oxide (NO), and on coming in contact with oxygen (of which atmospheric air contains one-fifth by volume) it forms a still higher oxide, nitric peroxide (NO_2), a gas possessing a ruddy colour. This, of course, vitiates the subsequent reasoning, but we see pretty well what Hales was at. He probably knew that during thunderstorms (of which there had been many previous to the earthquake) nitric acid in small quantities is formed, although he could scarcely have suspected that the lightning induced the oxygen and nitrogen of

which the air is composed to combine, because there being at that day no distinction between endothermic reactions and exothermic reactions he would have wondered why the whole atmosphere was not converted into nitric oxide by the lightning. He also knew that in volcanic regions sulphureous gases are evolved: consequently he imagined that he was reproducing, in miniature, what Nature effected on a vast scale.*

Hales was in fact in London during the second earthquake, for he adds:—

'I lay in a ground floor near St. Martin's Church, in the Strand, and was awake during all the time of the earthquake, 8th March, and plainly heard a large explosion up in the air, like that of a small cannon, which made one conjecture that the noise was caused by the rushing off and sudden expansion of the electrical fluid at the top of St. Martin's spire, where all the electrical effluvia which ascended up along the larger body of the tower, being by attraction strongly condensed and accelerated at the point of the spire, as they rushed off made so much the louder expansive explosion.'

The biographical remark respecting his lodgings near St. Martin's Church is instructive, because coming frequently to London to attend the Royal Society and other corporate bodies, it was plainly necessary for Hales to have some kind of habitat in the metropolis. Not only were there no 'taxis' to speed him at night to a non-existent Waterloo, but Teddington must have been further from town by reason of the non-existence of Richmond Bridge. That elegant structure whose

> '. . . . polished surface of unsullied white,
> With heightened lustre beams upon the sight;
> Still lovelier in the shining flood surveyed,
> 'Mid the deep masses of surrounding shade'

was not finished till 1777.

When the excitement caused by the earthquake had subsided, another stimulant was found to energise that vortex of pleasure without which the Georgian person of fashion regarded life as an insipid affair. It took the form of newly discovered medicinal waters at Glastonbury, in Somerset, where in 1751 they were found to rise from a spring near Chain Gate. They became highly popular. A pump room was opened in 1753, the public

* 'The history of errors, properly managed, often shortens the road to truth.' Sir Joshua Reynolds' 'Second Discourse.'

deserting Bristol, Bath, and other resorts in their favour. But their popularity was to receive a check, for the *Public Advertiser* of 1753 announced that these waters had been submitted to a celebrated chemist, who was unable to detect in them any constituent, beyond some excess of iron, to which any therapeutic value could be attributed.

A passage in the 'Memoirs of Bishop Hildesley' discloses who was the celebrated chemist:—

'Hales analysed mineral waters; and, from the pure love of truth and humanity, detected the impositions of those who would have recommended common water to the afflicted as a specific for all disorders. This he particularly exemplified in the Glastonbury waters; and in those of a spring not far from Godstone, in Surrey, which were very much extolled in the newspapers of the time, but clearly shown by Dr. Hales to possess no other properties than those of common spring water.'

In 1753 the veteran physician, and world-renowned collector, Sir Hans Sloane, died, and Hales was elected a member of the Paris Academy of Sciences in his place.

Despite advancing years, nothing more strikingly proves Hales' solicitude for the furtherance of scientific methods in commerce than his activity in helping to found that unique institution, the still flourishing Royal Society of Arts. From Sir Henry Wood we learn:—

'On 22nd March 1754 there was held at Rawthmell's coffee house, Henrietta Street, Covent Garden, "A meeting of some noblemen, clergy, gentlemen, and merchants, in order to form a society for the encouragement of arts, manufactures, and commerce in Great Britain." Eleven in all attended—Viscount Folkestone; Lord Romney; Dr. Stephen Hales, F.R.S.; Henry Baker, F.R.S. (naturalist and author, who married Defoe's youngest daughter); Gustavas Brander, F.R.S. (merchant, antiquary, and a director of the Bank of England); James Short, F.R.S. (optician and astronomer); John Goodchild; Nicholas Crisp (watchmaker, of Bow Churchyard); Charles Lawrence; Husband Messiter (a surgeon); and William Shipley.'

'On 5th February 1755, Viscount Folkestone was elected the first president, with Lord Romney, Charles Whitworth, James Theobald, and Stephen Hales, vice-presidents. John Goodchild was made treasurer, and William Shipley, secretary.'

The Society's income, during Hales' life, reflects the public favour it enjoyed—rising from £360 in 1755 to £3656 in 1761.

Hales was instrumental in securing for Teddington parish

a good water supply, and it is characteristic of the mechanical bent of his mind, and of his burning desire for precision, that he recorded in the parish register that the outflow would fill a two-quart vessel in 'three swings of the pendulum beating seconds, 'which pendulum was $39+\frac{2}{10}$ inches long from the suspending 'nail to the middle of the plumbet or bob.'

Among his other activities was the enlargement, in 1734, of the churchyard, 'by prevailing with the lord of the manor.' In 1748 he helped the parishioners to put up a lantern on the church tower, that the bells might better be heard. In 1754 the timber tower on which the lantern stood was demolished, and a brick one substituted. In 1753 he arranged for the erection of a new aisle, himself subscribing £200, and personally superintending the building operations.

His last signature in the Teddington registers occurs on 4th November 1760. He died on the 4th January following, and was buried, as was his desire, under the tower of the parish church which he had helped to rebuild. The Princess of Wales erected a monument to his memory in Westminster Abbey. It contains a bas-relief likeness in profile by Wilton.

Hales was painted by Francis Cotes, R.A., and the portrait was engraved by Hopwood. It appears in R. J. Thornton's 'Botanical Plates,' 1810, and a remarkably good-looking man he must have been. He also sat to Hudson.

By the instrumentality of the Duchess of Portland, the Rev. Edward Young, the author of 'Night Thoughts,' was offered the post of clerk to the closet to the Princess of Wales, vacant by the death of Hales, and in accepting it he pays the following tribute to his predecessor :—

'20*th January* 1761, *Welwyn*. I have taken some hours to consider of the very kind offer your Grace is so good to make me. I am old, and, I bless God, far from want; but as the honour is great and the duty small, and especially as your Grace seems desirous I should accept it, I do accept it with great gratitude for your remembrance of one who might easily and naturally be forgotten. The honour indeed is great, and in my sight greater still, as I succeed to so great and good a man. Would to God I could tread in all his other steps as well as this.'

The Rev. Mark Hildesley, appointed to the see of Sodor and Man in 1755, had for twenty years, as vicar of Hitchin, in Hertfordshire, been a friend and neighbour of Edward Young

at Wellwyn. Samuel Richardson, writing to the bishop on 24th September 1761, says :—

'. . . I have the great pleasure of congratulating you on Dr. Young's promotion, as he is the immediate successor and heir of one of the best divines, and soundest Christians, and usefulest genius that ever graced a court, or a nation—Dr. Stephen Hales. This, I know, is a circumstance that your Lordship will hear with pleasure. . . .'

To this the bishop, in somewhat doubtful English, answered :—

'Your paragraph relating to Dr. Young, did, as you rightly judged, give much pleasure; not so much as altogether on his account, as of the family he is likely to prove a blessing to, by supplying the great loss her Royal Highness and her offspring have suffered in the death of her late pious and worthy curator, in her domestic spiritual concerns. I wrote to good Dr. Hales, the 15th of October last, and, notwithstanding the usually uncertain passage of letters to and from hence, through the various hands they are committed to, by sea and land, I received an answer from him of two folio pages, close wrote, dated the 25th of the same month; at the conclusion of which, he says, "This is a long letter for one in his 84th year." As my father had the honour of dispensing the first rudiments of his education, the doctor thought proper to transfer some part of that regard he had for his tutor to the less worthy son.'

A passage in the obituary notice, in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for January 1761, affords an insight into Hales' individuality :—

'His knowledge appeared to everybody near him to feed his mind with a nourishment which gave him, in the decline of life, and even in its last stages, that vigour and serenity of understanding, and clearness of ideas, which so few possess, even in the flower of manhood, and which, he used often to say, he valued as the most perfect of all human pleasures. . . . There were two things in his character which particularly distinguished him from almost every other man. The first was, that his mind was so habitually bent on acquiring knowledge, that, having what we thought an abundant income, he was solicitous to avoid any further preferment in the church, lest his time and attention might thereby be diverted from his other favourite and useful occupations. The other feature of his character was no less singular. He could look even upon wicked men, and those who did him unkind offices, without any emotion of particular indignation; not from want of discernment or sensibility, but he used to consider them only like those experiments which, upon trial, he found could never be applied to any useful purpose, and which he therefore calmly and dispassionately laid aside.'

No less pleasing are Gilbert White's remarks to Robert Marsham, written on 25th February 1791—that is, thirty years after Hales' decease :—

'Though a man of a baronet's family, and of one of the best houses in Kent, yet was his humility so prevalent, that he did not disdain the lowest offices, provided they tended to the good of his fellow creatures. The last act of benevolence in which I saw him employed was at his rectory of Farringdon, the next parish to this (Selborne), where I found him in the street with his paint pot before him, and much busied in painting white, with his own hands, the tops of the footpaths' posts, that his neighbours might not be injured by running against them in the dark. His whole mind seemed replete with experiment. . . . He used to lament how tedious a task it was to convince men that sweet air was better than foul. He once told my father, with some degree of emotion, that the first time he went on board a ship in harbour at Portsmouth the officers were rude to him; and that he verily believed he should never have prevailed to have seen his ventilators in use in the Royal Navy, had not Lord Sandwich, then First Lord of the Admiralty, abetted his pursuits in a liberal manner, and sent him down to the Commissioners of the Dock with letters of recommendation.'

How comes it that a life of such noble endeavour and remarkable achievement looms so little in history? The answer, it is opined, lies in part in the mental attitude of the eighteenth century—a century that appreciated the artistic cult, but regarded matter as something essentially vile, and its investigation rather the business of the low mechanic—an attitude all too faithfully reflected in the dictum of one of the most gifted ladies of that, or any other century. For writing to the Abbé Conti in 1718, Lady Mary Wortley Montagu delivers herself thus:—

'Considering what short-lived, weak animals men are, is there any study so beneficial as the study of present pleasure? . . . You know how to divide the idea of pleasure from that of vice, and they are only mingled in the heads of fools. I had rather be a rich *effendi* with all his ignorance, than Sir Isaac Newton with all his knowledge.'

But if our sketch of this eighteenth-century philosopher have any pretence to accuracy, we are surely constrained to allow that he fulfilled, well-nigh to perfection, the ideal of his contemporary, Bishop Berkeley: 'Truth is the cry of all, but the game of a 'few. Certainly, where it is the chief passion, it doth not give 'way to vulgar cares and views; nor is it contented with a little 'ardour in the early time of life, active perhaps to pursue, but 'not so fit to weigh and revise. He that would make a real 'progress in knowledge must dedicate his age as well as youth, 'the latter growth as well as first fruits, at the altar of truth.'

J. PAUL DE CASTRO.

THE CALCUTTA UNIVERSITY COMMISSION

Calcutta University Commission, 1917-1919, Report. Part I., *Analysis of the Present Conditions*, vols. i.-iii., c. i.-xxix. Part II., *Recommendations of the Commission*, vols. iv.-v., c. xxx.-lii. Calcutta. 1919.

OF the literary quality of a blue-book (though, to be strictly accurate, it must be confessed that the book in question is not a blue-book, but a series of five books in a delicate field-grey) it beseems not critics to speak. Yet, without speaking, one may sigh; and these volumes provoke a gentle sigh. The Report of Mr. Montagu on the future government of India is a fairly slim volume, which one may easily slip into a pocket (*experto crede*). The Report of Sir Michael Sadler and his six colleagues on the future constitution of a university in one of the provinces of India (if one add eight volumes of appendices to five volumes of the Report proper) will fill a bookshelf. One of the commissioners is a distinguished educational scholar, who naturally runs into disquisitions—wise and illuminating disquisitions—on such things as the relation of universities to the State, or the relation of private to public effort in the field of secondary education. Another is a distinguished historical scholar who, believing that the roots of the present lie deep in the past, proceeds to prepare the ground for reform by a process of double digging which is at once instructive and exhaustive. No conclusion is stated without a large array of data; and sometimes the conclusion that emerges, after much marshalling of evidence, is one which the reader would gladly have accepted many pages before it is reached. Perhaps we who read educational reports are sceptics, and stand in need of much convincing; perhaps the commissioners were overwhelmed by the mass of evidence, and, having the pens of ready writers, they prepared 'Digesta' or 'Pandectæ' on a more liberal scale than Tribonian, who could boast that he had reduced 3,000,000 lines to some 150,000. At any rate the Report has two qualities. It is luminous. It is also voluminous.

This is enough, and perhaps more than enough, for a preliminary sigh; and we had better turn at once to the problem the commissioners have faced, and the solution they have sought to provide. It is a large problem, for the University of Calcutta is a very large university. Indeed, the Commissioners state that, 'in respect of the number of its students, it is the 'largest university in the world.' (The writer of these lines repeated the statement in a gathering of American students the other day, and, as he expected, received a letter, backed by figures, very soon afterwards, claiming a primacy for 'the land 'of all big things.') Be that as it may, there are 26,000 students in the University of Calcutta, the one university of Bengal, a province with a population of 45,000,000; and there are also 26,000, scattered in one knows not how many universities, in the United Kingdom, a country with the same population. As the United Kingdom scatters its students over more universities, so, it would appear, it scatters them more, or at any rate more evenly, among different subjects. The Arts Courses of the British Universities have a share—sometimes a small share—of the total number of students. In Bengal they have more than a share, and 22,000 students are said to be pursuing 'purely 'literary courses.' This is partly the outcome of the present, and partly the heritage of the past. It is the outcome of the present, in the sense that these literary courses open the door to Government offices and to clerical and teaching posts, which are almost the only desire, and practically the only opportunity, of the student of Bengal. It is the heritage of the past, in the sense that the middle classes of Bengal have for centuries sent their sons somewhere or other to receive a literary education, which has generally taken the form of memorising texts. This was being done in Bengal long before the British were there; and it is being done still, in much the same way, except that the texts are now drawn from Burke or Milton.

The present and the past thus conspire together to produce the Bengali student, who may be defined as one who pursues a literary education, too often by the aid of memorised texts, with a view to clerical employment. The end in view tends to make education utilitarian, even while it is literary; and the means employed serve to make it mechanical, without making it thorough. The whole system helps to produce a plethora

of graduates, without any adequate outlet for the happy and lucrative exercise of their faculties in after life. Government employment, in its lower as well as its higher grades, absorbs many; some drift into the profession of teaching, as a *pis aller* —for it is ill paid and not very highly regarded; the rest find some sort of clerical employment. Hitherto—so the commissioners say—the output has in one way or another been absorbed; but it is becoming increasingly difficult to find adequate outlets, and the problem of an intellectual proletariat, driven to disaffection by inadequacy or absence of employment, is becoming increasingly serious. Perhaps the majority of educational problems are also social problems; and the problem faced by the commissioners is no exception. It is significant that among their recommendations there is a suggestion for the creation of new outlets, new channels of employment, more especially in the form of educational posts of higher status and better pay.

If there are social problems involved in any investigation of an Indian university, there are also racial, or perhaps one should say religious, problems. Mahommedans constitute fifty-two per cent. of the population of Bengal; but they have little share in the great educational machine which is called the University of Calcutta. They stand mainly outside the Western scholastic system to which the Hindu inhabitants of the province have readily adapted themselves: they do not enter the high schools or the university: they go to *madrassahs* of their own for instruction in the traditional lore of Islam. Excluding themselves from the university, they have excluded themselves from the employment to which an education in the university leads. The Government has sought to protect them by a system of reserved places and by other means; but they have complaints to urge against the university in its present form—complaints in the matter of residence in colleges and the religious instruction of students in residence; complaints in the matter of curriculum, and the place of Islamic studies in the curriculum; complaints in the matter of representation of their special interests in the government of the university. It is another difficulty, but a much less serious difficulty, to find room among the sons of the Hindu middle classes for the sons of the backward classes of the Presidency, which include the aboriginal peoples. The

university is full of members of the three great literary castes —Brahmins, Kyasthas (writers), and Vaidyas (doctors); yet somehow, by their side, there must also be room for Namasudras and others in the lower ranks of the Hindu caste system.

But it is with educational, rather than social or religious problems, that the commissioners have to deal. The foundation and basis of the educational problem is the secondary school. Bengal has more than 700 high schools, all crowded, and all engaged in preparing pupils for the matriculation examination of the University of Calcutta—the largest examination in the world, which annually engulfs 16,000 examinees. Private zeal has been busy in the foundation of these schools. Such zeal has sometimes outrun discretion; and the supporters of one school have actually burned down another and rival establishment—as if Eton should set Harrow on fire. Some of the schools, like that of Sir Rabindranath Tagore, at Bolpur, do wonderful work; most of them are the slaves of the matriculation examination, which of itself gives access to a number of posts, and, by opening the door to the university, opens the door to other and higher posts. Of that examination we need say little; it is the Responsions, *plus* the School Certificate, *plus quodlibet aliud*, of Bengal; and Responsions alone, to say nothing of the other things, is more than enough for many of us at present. Examinations in general may be criticised; the matriculation examination of Calcutta may very easily be criticised. The worst effect is psychological. To pass is to get a post; and a boy is urged by the promptings of his family, and by the promptings of his own loyalty to his family, to cram himself for the examiner until he is full to the crop, and, during the process, to fall into a fever of mental indigestion and moral perturbation. *Tantum examinatio*. . . .

Let us leave the gruesome picture, and imagine a boy safely through his matriculation examination, and comfortably matriculated in the University of Calcutta. He will be about eighteen years of age. The age is fairly low for entry into the university; and the natural result is that the first two years at the university are spent in a continuation of school work. This is the intermediate stage. It is a very destructive stage. Only fifty per cent. of the matriculated students of any year pass the intermediate examination: the rest

either fail or drop off before they get near the examination. It is also a higgledy-piggledy stage. Different options may be taken; the ingenuity of youth discovers the easier options; and curious concatenations of subjects result. The favourite concatenation is said to be Sanskrit, logic, and chemistry, which seems somewhat dry and husky. It is no wonder that the commissioners report that the line between school and university is drawn too low, and should be put, as it were, two years higher; that, in a word, the intermediate stage should be banished from the university, and university education should begin at the end, and not, as it now does, at the beginning of that stage.

But what does entry into the university mean—apart from curricula and examinations—and what is the manner of a boy's life in the University? To enter the University of Calcutta, as to enter the University of Oxford or of Cambridge, means to enter a college. The university as such gives no teaching, except for what may be called graduate studies; all teaching for the degree of B.A. is given by colleges. A member of Oxford or Cambridge may feel himself on familiar ground when he hears of a university of colleges. But the Calcutta college is not as an Oxford college. For one thing, it is much larger. Three of the Calcutta colleges have between 1500 and 2000 students each. For another thing, a Calcutta college is not a society with a tone and a way of life and an *esprit de corps* of its own. It is a barrack-room with an agglomeration of students, paying lecture fees and attending lectures, who live not in colleges, but in hostels, in 'messes'—temporary boarding houses formed by students who club together to share expenses—and in private lodgings. The amenities, the intercourse, the stimulus, the self-imposed discipline of college life as it is lived in the older English universities—all these things are things unknown in the Calcutta hostels and messes, crowded places in which eight students may occupy one room, and common rooms for social life are seldom to be found.

It is true that there are colleges and colleges; and one college differs from another in status and character. Some, such as Presidency College, with its 1036 students, are Government colleges; some, such as the Scottish Churches College, with its 1142 students, are missionary colleges; others, such as Ripon

College, with its 1881 students, are private colleges. One thing is absent from them all; and that is a tutorial system, such as most old Oxford or Cambridge men associate peculiarly and particularly with their college days. The colleges of the University of Calcutta give lectures: they do not give tuition. The lectures are often dictated *résumés*; sometimes they are simply dictated answers to likely questions. Outside the lecture notes the student relies on one or two text-books; and partly because it is an inherited tradition to memorise, partly because, as he is working in the somewhat unfamiliar medium of English, he is driven to memorise, he often learns by heart his lecture notes and his text-books. An examiner in political science in one university reports that he has generally found in the candidates' answers large fragments of Mr. Stephen Leacock's 'Elements of Political Science,' of President Wilson's 'The 'State,' and of 'an honours graduate's' anonymous text-book. Libraries in which the students can read for themselves are mostly to seek. The commissioners describe in a footnote (I., p. 425) a work which caught their attention in one library. 'It was "More Gals' Gossip," by Pitcher, of the *Sporting Times*. 'It stood between a stray volume of Hodge's "Systematic 'Theology," and a novel by Mr. W. Le Queux.'

Under these conditions there is no honours work for the degree of B.A. All the work done by the colleges is pass work. Each college does this work for itself; there is no system of intercollegiate lectures. Over these self-contained colleges, each giving its pass lectures, the university stands with its examinations. Apart from graduate teaching—which is its province, and its exclusive province—the university is an examining body. The university dominates the colleges, on which it imposes rigid rules of affiliation; and thus examination dominates teaching. Everything, indeed, conspires to produce an idolatry of the examination—the university, the college, the student himself. The university provides the undergraduate student with an examination: it provides him with no lectures. The college provides him with lectures adjusted to the examination: it provides him with no tuition. The student himself is, as a rule, very poor, and profoundly anxious to pass an examination which may open the door to lucrative employment. He has no time to think of learning for its own sake; and, so

far as he can, he puts pressure on his lecturer to ensure that he shall provide, and only provide, examination fodder. The commissioners write—and Indian friends of the writer, engaged in teaching in Calcutta colleges, have written to him in the same sense—'of the students, under economic necessity, constraining 'their teachers into a rigid restriction of their teaching to the 'limits of a printed syllabus . . . . and obstinately closing their 'ears and minds to anything outside it.'

There is matter enough here—matter enough and to spare—for many remedies. But before we turn to remedies and solutions, there is one last element in the problem itself which claims our attention. This is the constitution and government of the University of Calcutta. The university is in many ways a department of State, and not, as western universities originally were, and still largely remain, a free community of 'masters 'and scholars.' In the beginning of Indian universities this was no doubt inevitable; the initiative and the funds must proceed from the Government. Even to-day—and not only in India, but also elsewhere—there is work for a Government to do in the supervision and correlation of universities. It would be absurd to talk of Government tyranny; but it is not absurd to talk of Government *mortmain*. Government lays a dead hand on what it touches in the sphere of university life. It can only act by mechanical rules and regulations, and such rules and regulations must mean mortification. It is not a good thing that the syllabus of the University of Calcutta can only be modified with the assent of the Government of India; it is not a good thing that the Senate of the University of Calcutta, like the Senate of most Indian universities, should be mainly composed of Government nominees; it is not a good thing that the officers of the university should be appointed by, or subject to the approval of, the Government.

Learning flourishes on *Lehrfreiheit*: university teachers must regulate the curriculum, constitute the Senate, and make the appointments of their university, if that university is to live the life of the mind. No society, indeed, can be exempt from the supervision of the State, which embraces all societies; and a university society which depends to any extent on State funds must, *a fortiori*, be subject to such supervision. But supervision is one thing, and direct control is another. In Calcutta to-day

the Government controls the university, and controls it in a complicated and paralysing way. Calcutta is the university of Bengal; but it is the Government of India—now resident not in Calcutta, but in Delhi—which controls that university; while, curiously enough, it is the Government of Bengal which controls the 'Government colleges' affiliated to it. This, at any rate, needs alteration; and while this is being altered, there is a convenient opportunity for further changes, which will give university teachers greater control of their teaching. It will not be an easy matter to effect such changes; for, mixed with educational considerations, there is bound to be a certain amount of nationalist sentiment, and the situation will crave wary walking. But the commissioners have good advice to give; and there is no part of the Report which merits more attention than that in which the relations of the State to universities are discussed (c. xxviii., §§ 82-92), and the general lines are suggested on which these relations should run.

It is time to turn from the 'analysis of present conditions' to the recommendations of the Commission. In making their recommendations, the commissioners have not confined themselves to the university; they have found themselves compelled to deal with the stage of secondary education which precedes the university. Their recommendations are legion; they affect accommodation, administration, curriculum, examination, and every range and ramification of education, from the high school to the graduate stage of university life. Their programme is large; and they themselves anticipate that it will take years to realise. It is perhaps arguable that they have been too ambitious. To build the building they plan, there is need for a prolonged and sustained effort. Might it not have been better to suggest some few simple and clear-cut reforms, and to have pressed for their immediate execution? Nor will their plans only involve time: they will involve money, and a good deal of money. At present, education in Bengal is cheap, in spite of all its defects. The system they propose, for all its merits, will be comparatively dear. The rock of finance, on which many attractive schemes stumble, looms up before their plans.

On the reform of secondary education, the commissioners

lay special stress. What they propose is to take away the intermediate stage of instruction from the university, and to put it back to the period of school life, to which they think that it properly belongs. It is consequential upon this proposal that the matriculation examination should cease to carry admission to the university, and that a new examination, based on the new stage taken from the university, and put back into school life, should take its place. The effect of this policy is the intercalation of a new link in the educational chain, and the addition of a new institution, midway between the high school proper and the university, to the educational system of Bengal. This is the intermediate college, 'the very pivot of our 'whole scheme of reform,' 'the most immediately valuable 'reform which can be undertaken in the educational sphere.' This college will take over a boy who has passed, at the age of sixteen *plus*, the 'high school examination,' which is the old matriculation examination reformed. It will give him two years of training, and if he passes a new 'intermediate college 'examination,' it will send him to the university.

The intermediate college will not always be a special or separate institution. Sometimes it may be attached to another institution, such as a specially efficient high school, which may have pupils in the intermediate stage as its topmost range. Whatever its form, it works by school methods; and by those methods it seeks to do two things—partly to prepare its pupils for the university; partly to prepare them, if they are not going to the university, for the various professions, and especially for the profession of teaching. Over the intermediate college, and over the high school also—over the intermediate college examination, and over the high school examination also—there is to be set a new authority. This is to be a Board of Secondary and Intermediate Instruction, which is to be neither a Government Department nor a university delegacy, but something of both, and something also of other things. Meanwhile, the salaries of teachers are to be raised; and in order to improve the general standard of teaching in high schools and intermediate colleges, a special corps of teachers—Indians or Europeans, who have been trained in western methods—is to be mobilised.

Criticism of the new Board of Secondary and Intermediate

Instruction may be left to experts. The cardinal element in the scheme is not the Board, but the new intermediate college. This college will often be a special and separate institution. It may be doubted whether it is good for students to pass from institution to institution during their educational course ; whether a new institution between high school and university is not a confusing breach in continuity ; whether the student who migrates from place to place may not be a rolling stone. The new scheme also raises doubts when one reflects on another point. The commissioners criticise the present system of education in the University of Calcutta as inadequate ; and they then proceed to make it more adequate by what one may vulgarly call a process of hurrying it up. They require a boy to move two years forward ; to stand at eighteen and a half where he stood before at twenty ; and they hope to achieve this result by the invention of a new institution. This seems optimistic.

There are other considerations which occur to the mind. One among them deserves to be mentioned. Secondary education is a problem in itself ; and secondary schools have to be considered not only as means, and in reference to universities, but also as ends, and in themselves. The commissioners have sought to consider both aspects ; but being primarily and mainly concerned with university education, they have naturally considered secondary education with especial reference to its bearing on university studies. It may be argued, and indeed it has been argued by some critics, that the Commissioners propose to treat during the school age, and by school methods, a stage of education not designed for schoolboys, which will be worse, not better, handled if school methods are applied. Separate intermediate colleges may be strange and somewhat desolate half-way houses, neither belonging exactly to the school stage nor yet to that of the university ; while intermediate colleges, which are the top ranges of selected high schools, may present grave problems, especially if youths of twenty or twenty-one, who have not yet passed the entrance examination to the university, are allowed to stay at school and to associate with boys of twelve or thirteen.

The commissioners speak of intermediate colleges as the pivot of their scheme ; but it is the proposals which they make

for the university proper which are the most germane and the most essential of their recommendations. These proposals form an interconnected chain. The commissioners start by proposing a new system of honours degrees; they are then led to propose a new scheme of tutorial guidance side by side with the old system of lectures; and since the tutorial guidance must come from the colleges of the university, they next proceed to suggest methods for strengthening and linking together those colleges. From that they rise to a consideration of the relations which ought properly to exist between colleges and the university; and so they arrive at their final suggestions, which are concerned with the methods by which the autonomy of the university and its colleges may be secured.

If students in the intermediate stage are removed from the university, the commissioners calculate that there will be, in all probability, some 6000 undergraduate students for whom a system of training has to be provided. The system which they propose is based on a distinction between honours men and pass students. For the former they suggest a three years' course, not necessarily, or in all cases, highly specialised; for the latter they suggest a course which, at the earliest practicable date, should also be made to cover three years, and should be arranged in carefully considered groups of subjects. An honours student may be allowed to proceed to the degree of M.A. or M.Sc. within not less than a year from the date of taking the degree of B.A.; and he may, in appropriate cases, be allowed to proceed to the higher degree on presenting a thesis, and without any obligation of attendance at lectures or of passing a written examination. A pass man, on the other hand, should only proceed to the degree of M.A. or M.Sc. after an interval of two years, and only after attendance at lectures and the passing of a written examination.

This is the first link of the chain. The next is the introduction of a tutorial system. Students will need advice in the choice between honours and pass courses, or again between different honours schools or pass groups: they will need guidance in honours work, and they will profit by guidance in pass work. This will involve a scheme of tutorial guidance, and that will involve a strengthening of the staffs of colleges. Again, the new liberty of choice will mean an ending of the self-sufficiency of the college. No college will be able to provide from its own

resources all the instruction that is needed; and therefore a scheme of intercollegiate lectures, involving co-operation between colleges, will also be necessary. All this is familiar enough ground to Oxford and Cambridge men; and when the commissioners lay it down that all undergraduate students should still be required to be members of a college of the university, the ground seems still more familiar.

But here the commissioners add a new link, and the new link is much less familiar. They proceed to speak of the co-operation of the colleges and the university; and for what they have to say on this matter it is not so easy to find parallels, though London is perhaps the nearest. The colleges may be strengthened and brought into closer co-operation; but the university, as distinct from the colleges, and as transcending the colleges, is to have its place and its powers. The powers with which it is to be armed are two-fold. It is to approve and grade the colleges. It is also, within a certain area, to approve, and thus, to a certain extent, to grade, the teachers in the colleges.

There are to be three types of colleges—apart from a peculiar type, the 'incorporated' college, which is really a department of the university with its own buildings, financed by the university, and dealing, on behalf of the university, with a particular subject, such as Law or Science or (possibly) Sanskrit. The first is the college proper—the 'constituent' college. The second is the 'temporarily affiliated' college. Both of these will be Calcutta colleges; but outside both these will be a third type, which we may call the 'provincial' (or *mufassal*) colleges —that is to say, colleges outside Calcutta, in the 'provinces' (metaphorically speaking) of the Presidency of Bengal. 'Constituent' colleges must satisfy certain requirements before they can be accepted by the university. They must not contain more than 1000 students; they must provide teachers for those students in the proportion of 1 to 25; they must guarantee their teachers reasonable conditions of tenure and salary; they must have suitable buildings and equipment, ceasing to be a 'barrack of lecture-rooms,' and becoming places of common-rooms, class-rooms, good libraries, and proper laboratories; and finally, they must have a properly constituted governing body, containing representatives drawn both from the university and from the staff of their own teachers, and acting under an

approved trust deed. 'Temporarily affiliated' colleges are colleges that cannot satisfy these requirements, but are admitted on probation, as it were, and for limited periods, provided they satisfy certain requirements of a less exacting character. Their teachers are to be of a lower status than those of constituent colleges; their students, unlike those of constituent colleges, are to be excluded from lectures arranged by the university, unless they pay a fee.

As for the 'provincial' colleges, it is the hope of the commissioners that they will ultimately either rise to be independent universities, or sink to the position of intermediate colleges; but, meanwhile, it is proposed that they should be brought under a special Board — the Board of Mufassal Colleges—of the University of Calcutta, which is to seek to concentrate the resources they can afford for a university training in certain selected centres. Whether this is the best solution of the problem of the 'provinces'—whether it might not have been better boldly to create a new federal university of the colleges outside Calcutta, or, alternatively, to have started at once some two or three new provincial universities on the analogy of that just founded at Dacca—only an expert can say. Meanwhile, there is one feature of the proposals of the commissioners for the 'provincial' colleges which, as they themselves confess, may arouse challenge and debate; and that is the suggestion that students of these colleges, while they receive the degrees of the University of Calcutta, like students from constituent and other Calcutta colleges, should nevertheless enjoy distinct curricula and examinations. The anomaly is defended by the commissioners; but it remains an anomaly.

So far of the approval and grading of colleges by the university. We may now turn to the part played by the university in grading and approving teachers. There should, it is suggested, be three categories of teachers in the university. The first category, relatively small, is that of professors, readers, lecturers, and assistants appointed and paid entirely by the university. This implies that the university, instead of confining its teaching to graduate students, is to join in the teaching of undergraduates. The second category is that of teachers paid both by a college and by the university, and either appointed on the basis of some agreement made between a college and the

university, or appointed originally by a college as college tutors, and subsequently appointed by the university to give university lectures, open to all students in constituent colleges. This category would contain the great majority of university teachers; and the great majority would thus be appointed and controlled on what may be called a system of dyarchy. The third category is that of teachers paid wholly by colleges, and appointed wholly by colleges, who are to give lectures confined to the students of their college, unless, by private treaty with other colleges, arrangements are made to throw the lectures open to students of those colleges. Even in this category the university is to have the right to 'recognise' college teachers, 'in order that the 'responsibility of the university in regard to the character of 'the teaching given in its name may not be impaired'; and until he is 'recognised,' no college teacher is to give lectures which can 'be counted towards any requirements laid down (by 'the university) for the attendance of students'—that is to say, in simpler language, no unrecognised teacher is to give lectures which will count in any way as qualifying those who attend them for entering for university examinations.

This is a complicated system, which raises doubts; but we may treat these doubts as a 'reserved subject,' or rather, as a subject 'transferred' to another and later stage of this article; and we may turn to note a somewhat peculiar and highly interesting category of teachers which the commissioners propose for Presidency College—the great Government college of the university. These are teachers trained in the West (whether Indians or Englishmen) who are to be appointed in England by a mixed body, consisting of representatives of Presidency College and the University of Calcutta, who happen to be residents or visitors in England, and of members appointed by the Secretary of State for India. The purpose of the suggestion is to provide a special *corps d'élite* of trained professors, just as the purpose of an analogous suggestion, already mentioned, was to provide a similar special body of trained teachers for high schools. It is to be hoped that the suggestion may take effect; it is equally to be hoped that, if it takes effect, the best talents of our British universities will be ready to compete for entry into this special reserve. There is no service in the world of education—there is no service in the British Empire—

which can be greater than that of going to teach, and to teach worthily, the quick-witted and eager students of Bengal.

There is much more that might be said by way of exposition of the commissioners' recommendations—as, for instance, concerning the education of women, or the training of teachers, matters which, in themselves, are sufficient for many articles; but we must turn at once to the exposition of a final set of recommendations, which concern the government and the autonomy of the university. For its own government the university is to be equipped, according to the design of the commissioners, with a large variety of organs. On its administrative side it is to possess a court, distinguished and multitudinous, of some 400 to 500 persons; an Academic Council—a body new to India, but with its parallels in the West—of some 80 to 100 members; and an Executive Council, for daily purposes, of 17. On the more purely academic side there are also to be three ranges—at the top, Faculties; next to them, Boards of Studies, each handling a specific subject, such as, for instance, History; and next to these, Committees of Courses, for the regulation of the various Honours Courses and the main pass groups. These are not the only organs. There is the Board of Mufassal Colleges, already mentioned; there is a Board of Students' Welfare, to improve accommodation and to encourage corporate life among the students; there is a Board of Women's Education; and there are many other boards. University reformers are often tempted to construct boards. The worst of boards is that they may be wooden and dead, rather than growing and spreading trees of life. The best work in universities is done by individual men of vision and energy. Perhaps the multitude of boards projected for Calcutta may give such men their chance, if they are there; but if they are not, the university may be a place of much dead wood.

At any rate the university is sufficiently equipped for an autonomous life; and with this equipment it may cease to be a department of State, and become a *universitas* of masters and scholars. The Government of India is therefore to cease to have any especial control of Calcutta University. It will still have a general connexion with that university, as it will also have with other Indian universities; but that general connexion will take the form of visitation, co-ordination, organisation of research

in special cases, assistance in recruitment, and the like—functions which the general Government of India will exercise on behalf of Indian universities generally. The Government of Bengal, on the other hand, will have a special connexion with the University of Calcutta; but that connexion, if it is something more than visitation, will be something less than control. The Governor of Bengal will be Chancellor of the University, and, as such, enjoy certain rights and privileges. The Government of Bengal will give its consent to university statutes (as the King in Council gives his consent to certain university statutes and to college statutes in the University of Oxford); it will be represented on the governing bodies of the university; it will make a 'block grant' to the university, which the university will then be free to allocate. But the university will manage its curricula; it will control its finance; it will make its appointments. A number of posts, which have been Government posts in a Government service, will thus become university posts, held under conditions determined by the university.

This is the liberation of what one may call the 'masters' from Government; and, in a different way, but with a similar purpose, the commissioners seek also to liberate the scholar, during his term of university study, from that bondage to the desire and prospect of a governmental post, which has hitherto cramped his studies. Degrees and other university qualifications are no longer to be treated as in themselves the one condition of admission to Government service; but a small Civil Service Commission is to be set up in Bengal, and in other provinces, to review the whole series of posts committed to its charge; to determine the educational stage which must be reached before candidates can be admitted to competitions; and to conduct competitive tests among qualified candidates for such posts. The effect of the proposal is to separate Civil Service Examinations from University Examinations, and that is all to the good. It should be added—for the point is one of much importance—that the commissioners do not advocate the immediate introduction of a competitive test for the selection of candidates in India for the Covenanted Civil Service itself. They consider that, until an adequate university standard has been established in India, the introduction of a competitive test for posts in this service would dominate and pervert university work, or else divert good

students from universities to cramming establishments. They quote a pregnant saying of Mr. H. J. Maynard, the Vice-Chancellor of the Punjab University: 'A real competitive 'examination held in India for such a service as the Indian Civil 'Service would entirely dominate the course of higher educa-'tion; and unless the universities took to teaching its subjects '. . . students would turn elsewhere, and cramming establish-'ments would be thronged.'

We have reached the end of the Report of the commissioners; but we have not yet reached the end of the fifth volume of the Report. At the end of that volume there are three supplementary notes, which are written—one in conjunction, the other two separately—by Dr. Zia-ud-din Ahmad, Mathematical Professor at Aligarh, and Dr. Gregory, Professor of Geology in the University of Glasgow, who dissent on some points from the recommendations of their fellow commissioners. These minority reports are important, because they bring us back to what was mentioned above as a subject reserved for further discussion—the relation of colleges to the university. They are dismissed, in what appears a brusque note (vol. v., p. 351), by the other commissioners; but they deserve attention. Their effect is to suggest greater independence of colleges and a less amount of university control. In any university composed of colleges—in Oxford and Cambridge no less than in Calcutta—there is always a school of centralisation which tends to claim the merit of being 'advanced,' and sometimes that of being the real friend of research; and there is always a school of federalists, who believe that the college is a real force and a living society, while central university boards may be wood—or even paper. Perhaps it is not fanciful to claim Dr. Zia-ud-din Ahmad and Dr. Gregory for the school of federalism.

They suggest, in the first place, that the colleges should be free to specialise, and to undertake separate branches of teaching. They cite the analogy of Durham University, in which one college undertakes theology, and another science and commerce; and they remark that, 'owing to this division 'of work, the colleges work harmoniously, and can be entrusted 'with great freedom.' They are not very optimistic about inter-collegiate lectures; the distance between the colleges, and the heavy rain-fall during the summer, seem to them to be obstacles

—small, yet serious—in the way of any easy circulation of students. Above all, they raise (in separate notes) grave doubts about the proposals of the majority of the commissioners in regard to university 'recognition' of college teachers. They note that the proposals of the majority involve three grades of college teachers—those who are 'appointed' by the university to be also university professors or readers; those who are 'recognised' by the university as competent to deliver lectures which will count; and those who have not been 'recognised' by the university. They remark that difficulties may arise from the dual control over the first grade; they plead that it is, at any rate, a mistake to distinguish the second and third grades; and they ask that all the teachers of a college should be recognised as a body. With that plea, and that request, one cannot but sympathise. Whatever may be thought about the dual control to which the first grade is subjected, it seems clear that the distinction between the second and third grades is 'invidious and harassing, and detrimental to the harmony of 'a college staff.'

One last word . . . Oxford and Cambridge are now, in the language of Henry VIII.'s 'Act of Supremacy,' about to be 'visited, reformed, and amended.' Eager reformers are canvassing the ways of amendment. They might not do amiss if they spent part of a vacation in reading and digesting this Report on the University of Calcutta. There are not, indeed, the same problems of finance at Calcutta which there are at Oxford and Cambridge. In other respects, however, Calcutta simply bristles with problems; and many of them are problems parallel to the problems of Oxford and Cambridge. *Ex una discamus duas;* from this one university let us learn to understand the two others.

ERNEST BARKER.

EGYPT AND PALESTINE

IT is possible now to regard with some accuracy of historical perspective the two campaigns by means of which Field-Marshal Lord Allenby succeeded in driving the Turks out of Palestine and Syria, smashing their forces with a swift thoroughness unequalled in other theatres of the war, and liberating from Turkish tyranny and reactionary maladministration an area extending from the frontier of Egypt far into the interior of Asia Minor.

With the ample information now accessible, the military historian may appraise the peculiar blend of audacity and skill with which these two campaigns were conducted. It will fall to him to record, in a sombre prelude, the two disastrous failures in the spring of 1917 to capture the Turkish stronghold of Gaza, failures of which the full story has not yet been told. He will picture the dreary weeks of despondency and hardship which followed. In more buoyant vein, he will proceed to describe the sudden and exhilarating change which took place in the morale of our troops when General Allenby took over the command on 28th June 1917, and proceeded with energy and infectious enthusiasm to reorganise his army. The military historian will delight to dwell upon the ingenuity with which the attack upon the strong Turkish Gaza-Beersheba line was planned, and the zest with which it was pressed forward from the opening of the bombardment of Gaza on 27th October to the fall of the town ten days later, by which time Beersheba also had been captured and the Turkish forces were in full retreat. Equally will he picture the rapid advance upon Jerusalem and Jaffa, carried out after the rains had begun, but with an ardour which the most torrential and persistent downpour could not diminish. He will note the masterly strategy displayed in the capture of the post called Junction Station early in the morning of 14th November by which the flying forces of the enemy were divided into two portions, the one hurrying northward towards Jaffa and the sea, the other seeking refuge amidst the arid

fastnesses of the Judæan hills. He will pause to note the completeness, refreshing in a war of many half-won triumphs, of operations during which our troops advanced sixty miles in a fortnight, drove a Turkish army of ten divisions out of a position in which it had been entrenched for six months, gave battle whenever it attempted to stand, and inflicted losses upon it of nearly two-thirds of its original effectiveness. He will describe the fall, on 16th November 1917, of Jaffa, fragrant among her orange groves, the stubborn ascent of the Judæan hills under immense difficulties of transport and weather conditions, the surrender of the Holy City itself on 9th December, and the unassuming simplicity of the victorious general's official entry two days later.

Nor was the second campaign of General Allenby—to use his then title—less masterly in conception. The spring and summer of 1918 were devoted largely to a reorganisation of his army. There was urgent need in France for more British troops, and their place in the Egyptian Expeditionary Force had to be taken by native infantry from India and Indian cavalry from France. On 19th September General Allenby began the campaign which, in his own words, 'resulted in the 'destruction of the enemy's army, the liberation of Palestine 'and Syria, and the occupation of Damascus and Aleppo.' The military historian will not indeed find it an easy task to keep pace in his record with this astonishing enterprise. Certainly in no theatre of the war has cavalry been employed with so unerring a skill, to so great an extent, or with such crushing effect. The advance into Northern Syria and Cilicia from our positions a few miles to the north of Jaffa and Jerusalem was carried out at a pace far exceeding the powers of infantry. Nor is it too much to say that for many days our troops 'lived on the country.' Dates and distances are here illuminating. Four days after these operations began we captured Haifa, the port which is now destined to become the commercial capital of Palestine. On 1st October Beirut fell; Tripoli on 13th October; and Aleppo, over three hundred miles from our former front, on 26th October. The Armistice with Turkey was signed on 30th October, that with Austria on 4th November, that with Germany on 11th November. The war had ended.

In his analysis the military historian will certainly include the vindication of cavalry afforded by the Syrian campaign, since the development of trench warfare in France had brought doubt as to the future value of that arm in war. Further, he will point out how great were the difficulties of supply and transport in General Allenby's campaigns. The force for the Jerusalem operations comprised some 267,000 British and Indian troops. At the date of the Armistice with Turkey, General Allenby had under his command 341,000 British and Indian troops, whilst his military organisation included in addition over 130,000 Egyptians. As opportunity for transport by water from his base in Egypt was practically negligible owing to the lack of seaports, the whole task of supplying the troops engaged in the Palestine and Syrian campaigns devolved upon the Palestine Military Railway. This railway, a remarkable instance of British doggedness and resource, had its starting point at Kantara, on the Suez Canal, and had been laid down mile by mile, together with a pipe line, behind the advancing troops. Pushing sturdily forward over the heavy sand and desolate levels of the Sinai Peninsula, the railway penetrated Palestine, traversing the fertile Gaza plains. From Ludd, a branch, following the line of the original French-constructed Jaffa-Jerusalem railway, climbed the mountains to the Holy City, a distance of 358 kilometres from the Suez Canal. The main line, passing through a generally fertile and level area between the mountains and the Mediterranean, had its terminus at the seaport of Haifa, beneath the stately slopes of Carmel.

It is not difficult to imagine the strain thrown upon this slender line of communication which was responsible for carrying over a distance of some three hundred miles practically everything that so considerable and varied a force required—its reinforcements, its food and its forage, its ammunition and its vehicles, its guns, its clothes, its animals, its tents and its technical stores, while its wounded and sick were sent 'down 'the line' to the large hospitals in Egypt. Yet, however exacting the emergency, the Palestine Military Railway never failed to cope with it. At one critical juncture, indeed, the railway staff, whose pluck and resource were throughout beyond praise, actually placed on the track and successfully handled twice as much traffic as they themselves had estimated to be

their maximum capacity before the emergency arose. In virtue of what it achieved this railway may justly be considered one of the unqualified successes of the war, and the experience gained in its construction and administration cannot fail to be of value in future warfare. Still further to increase its efficiency, a swing bridge was thrown across the Suez Canal at Kantara. To those who, with the writer, were present in the partially repaired railway station at Jerusalem on the morning of 15th June 1918, and witnessed the departure of the first through train in history from the Holy City to Cairo, it seemed as if a significant step had been taken in the onward march of civilisation. Moreover, it became a matter of accepted routine to leave Cairo, in leisurely wise, after tea, to board that night at Kantara the Palestine Military Railway train, aptly dubbed by the troops the 'Milk and Honey Express,' and to lunch the next day in the Holy City!

Yet other lessons in the practice of open warfare under Eastern conditions were learned in Palestine and Syria. In no other campaign of the war, for example, were contrasts of climate and natural conditions swifter or more violent. The line of communications, beginning in the hot dry sand of Sinai, passed first through the moist lowlands of Gaza and Ludd to the arid and barren highlands of Judæa. From Jerusalem, aloof and stately upon its summits, 2500 feet above the sea, it descended to Jericho, sweltering amid its lush and rank vegetation, in a climate hitherto believed impossible for Europeans after early spring, and 1000 feet below the level of the Mediterranean. From Judæa, traversing stony tablelands, it passed to the heights of Lebanon, to the rich plains of Northern Syria, and to the stern and rugged peaks of Cilicia, through which the Baghdad railway burrows its way to the valleys of Euphrates and Tigris. Contrasts such as these present many urgent military problems—the health and clothing of the men, the wear and tear of wheels, harness, and saddlery, and materials of all kinds, especially metal; the transport of casualties where there are no roads, the preservation of machine guns and other delicate mechanisms from sand. To these matters much close scrutiny was given in the Egyptian Expeditionary Force. Not less important was the medical and sanitary work undertaken, bacteriological research and disinfection, the handling of malaria,

and the cleaning up of unhealthy districts. Engineering work was immense, and of permanent value throughout Palestine and Syria. It was, for instance, with an unforgetable thrill of romance that many visited a picturesque and fragrant valley, a little to the southward of Bethlehem, where British soldiers were clearing and putting into working order, for the water supply of the Holy City, reservoirs and conduits which had been built whilst Christ was still a child.

These are some of the subjects with which the military historian will deal in his record of Field-Marshal Lord Allenby's Palestine and Syrian campaigns. What will the statesman and student of social and economic developments have in their turn to say?

One thing is clear. The decision reached in the summer of 1917, to undertake an offensive against the Turk in Palestine, was, from a political standpoint, a momentous decision for the future of the world. Those who took the decision, as well as the public at large, preoccupied with the direct issue of war, did not perhaps fully realise what was involved. It is time to realise it now. In one sense, it matters relatively little under whose authority the vast territories of the Middle East, wrested by British arms from the Turk, may finally pass, or by what panoply of mandates the interests of this or that Power may be secured. What has happened is that at last, after centuries of ignorant and reactionary misgovernment, the Middle East with all its ascertained wealth, its historical associations, and its economic possibilities, has been thrown open to civilisation. Palestine, Syria, Mesopotamia are ready now for development on modern lines. This opening up of the Middle East must necessarily affect the industrial and commercial life of the world. But what is done in the liberated regions during the next few years must be done with great care and understanding; the issues raised are too grave for hasty action. Profound depths of racial and religious feeling have been violently stirred, and venerable and stately traditions oppose a barrier to ill-considered changes. British arms have won freedom for a part of the world in which previously Great Britain had never played more than a minor part, and as a necessary consequence British responsibilities have been greatly enlarged.

It is the nature of the Englishman continually to increase

his responsibilities, and on the whole to govern other people's countries rather better than he governs his own. It is an inborn spirit of adventure which sends him forth to colonise, for there have never really been more Englishmen than England could provide a living for. It is an inborn knack of governing that has given him prestige above other European nations among less advanced communities. These things may be said without presumption. Nor do these qualities atrophy in time of peace: they may lie fallow. But in time of war they become dominant, dictating policy and action. That is why the Englishman wages war after a fashion different to anybody else. Other nations when at war concentrate their efforts. If they have stretched tentacles over distant parts of the world their desire generally is to draw them in. Should they aim at conquest, the territories they covet usually march with their own. It is not so with the Englishman. Accustomed to a world-view of his responsibilities, he never hesitates to embark upon distant campaigns and to lavish money upon them. To him they are but the normal practice of empire, and empire he accepts as his hereditary English job. He will regard with pride, and with a quite genuine sense of responsibility, the annexation of some remote area or tropical island whose population was quite content with primitive savagery, whose climate may be highly perilous to Europeans, and whose natural resources may be relatively negligible. It is interesting to reflect that Field-Marshal Allenby's campaigns were characteristically English both in conception and execution. Only the Englishman would have thought of them. No one but the Englishman could have carried them out as they were carried out.

Commerce will have its questions to put; will ask how far Palestine may develop under modern methods of agriculture; what irrigation will do for Mesopotamia; how the immense natural resources of Syria can best be handled and brought to the world's markets? It is not yet possible to answer these questions in detail. Many complex problems remain to be solved. But one point must be emphasised. In these liberated countries the prestige of the Englishman is at the moment paramount. The Englishman freed them. He crushed his enemy swiftly, and with overwhelming completeness; and the

Eastern mind both appreciates and admires the qualities of a conqueror. More than this, the provisional civil administration set up by Field-Marshal Allenby in the countries he had freed carried out its work, despite great difficulties, in the happiest vein of the old English colonising spirit, at once generous and practical, always informed by honesty and fairness as between man and man. On populations ground down by centuries of bullying, and bled white by corruption, the exercise of these English qualities produced a profound effect, and this was notably increased by the kindliness everywhere displayed by the troops, their friendly generosity, and their reverence in the holy places.

The opening up of the Middle East will necessarily have a marked effect on the future of Egypt. Hitherto Egypt has remained curiously aloof in her economic life. Her commercial intercourse was till recently chiefly carried on with the Western European nations, whose representatives in Alexandria and Cairo had come to dominate Egyptian industry. Largely unnoticed at home, profound changes were taking place in Egypt during the war. To the superficial view, it appeared as if no country within British authority was less affected by the war, and had less to bear of its strain.

The causes of the violent revolutionary outbreak in Egypt in the spring of 1919 are not in themselves difficult to ascertain. Already, in the early months of the war, the situation in Egypt had given rise to grave anxiety. Partially quiescent since the murder of Boutros Pasha in 1910, it was perfectly well known that the revolutionary 'Egypt for the Egyptians' party was gaining strength. In 1914 sedition was once more openly talked. For some time before the war, Germany had carried on an extensive system of espionage in Egypt, and was actively supporting the revolutionary propaganda. Unscrupulous and blatantly inaccurate reports of the earlier operations in Belgium and France were diffused by German agency throughout the Mohammedan world, and Germany took good care that her lying news should reach the Egyptians from Turkey before the correct version of events could arrive from England over the congested cables. Thus the Mons retreat was described as a complete and shattering débâcle and the beginning of the end of British empire, while detailed news was spread broadcast of

an army of a million and a half Afghans pouring through the Khyber Pass, at the further end of which a mutinous India was eagerly awaiting them. It was not easy closely to estimate the effect of this propaganda on the native mind, but it was clearly considerable. Moreover, the dominating personality of Lord Kitchener, idolised by the 'fellahin,' had been abruptly withdrawn from Egyptian affairs.

In the strange and inscrutable mind of the East profound passions were astir, and there were those who asked one another questions far outstripping frontiers and political conventions. There was, for example, the issue of Mohammedanism, a force still in many ways extraordinarily cohesive over vast areas of the world. In the dividing up of the nations which a great war involves, was it not at least possible that the Moslem world, with the bond of a common faith and a common philosophy, would disregard all else but its own unity? What effect then would the entry of Turkey into the war against Great Britain have in Egypt? Early in February 1915 a Turkish force crossed the Sinai Peninsula and reached the Suez Canal. It was easily repulsed and did no damage, but had the Canal been successfully crossed it is at least possible that a serious revolutionary uprising would have occurred in Egypt at a time when the authorities were by no means well equipped to deal with it. Nor must it be forgotten that on the western frontier of Egypt considerable trouble was given by the fanatical Mohammedan tribe of the Senussi, who had been stirred to action by German and Turkish agents, and who threw in their lot with the Turks in November 1915. Operations, of which too little is generally known, for they were admirably carried out, were conducted against the Senussi on a front much longer than England, and as difficult to penetrate as any in Africa. In a vigorous campaign between 11th December 1915 and 14th March 1916 the Senussi were soundly beaten, and in February of the following year, a brilliant and successful dash was made inland by motor car upon Siwa, their huge and sinister desert stronghold, a city, like Lhasa, of many mysteries, once a centre of the worship of Jupiter Ammon, and for centuries subsequently a temple of the most rigid and violent Mohammedan fanaticism. When the frenzy of faith is let loose upon the world, who can say what sober institutions may not be overturned, what well-

grounded conventions uprooted? No one indeed can be sure that the heart of the Moslem world is not still beating in unison with Constantinople, even though in his prayers the Mussulman turns his face towards a Mecca set free by British power, even though a Mussulman soldier, with the might of the British Empire behind him, guards the portal of the Mosque of Omar in Jerusalem.

A very serious element in the Egyptian disturbances of last year was the fact that, for the first time in the history of the British occupation, the peasantry showed themselves virulently hostile. Inspired by emissaries sent out on 10th March 1919 from El Azhar University in Cairo—the great and crowded Mohammedan stronghold, with whose reactionary tradition and immense authority even the most enlightened of administrations has hitherto been timid of interfering—the 'fellahin' rose in revolt, smashed railways and paralysed traffic. This was due to several causes all born of the stress of the war. There is no doubt that the drain of officials from the British branch of the Civil Service, for various purposes of the war, seriously impaired administrative efficiency. In provinces left very much to themselves corruption at once began. Recruiting for the Egyptian Labour Corps, Field-Marshal Allenby's invaluable auxiliary arm, had to be made practically compulsory. By 1918 the Egyptian Expeditionary Force included some 100,000 Egyptian coolies. The great majority of these men were peasants, and wisely engaged on short term contracts, but the annual turnover, over and above the replacement of casualties, was nevertheless as heavy as 270,000. Owing to the lack of sufficient British officials, the enlistment of these men fell into the hands of native Egyptians. These, in many cases, called up far more recruits than were required, took backsheesh for release from all but the needed number, and sent into the field men who were either personal enemies or too poor to bribe. Cases, too, occurred where the food stocks of the peasantry were commandeered at army rates by native officials, the peasants then being obliged to buy their own supplies at exorbitant prices from profiteers who were co-operating with the officials themselves. It is rumoured that collections for various charitable war purposes became, in the hands of the native officials, practically forced levies, and that considerable portions of the sums

collected never got so far as Cairo. It is certain that a great deal of corruption went on in connection with the purchase of camels for the Egyptian Expeditionary Force, of which an average of 30,000 had to be maintained during the period covered by Field-Marshal Allenby's Palestine and Syrian campaigns. Whenever complaints were made by the victims of this maladministration, the blame was of course laid by the native officials at the door of a brutal and exacting British administration. It is not to be wondered at that thousands of the 'fellahin' came to believe that earlier British methods of fairness and sympathy merely indicated a cynical process of 'lying low,' and that by these new injustices, after the establishment of the Protectorate, the Englishman was simply 'showing 'his hand.' From which it was clear to the peasant, accustomed for generations to bullying and plunder, that the Englishman, despite his professions, was no better than the Turk, while, unlike the Turk, he did not cherish the true faith.

Stated plainly these things meant that while in Palestine and Syria British prestige was reaching heights hardly paralleled in the history of the British Empire, in Egypt it had sensibly diminished. There were fewer capable Englishmen in authority in the country, and the more recent type of official has been a good deal less satisfactory, both socially and intellectually, than his predecessor. Military requirements prevented much civilian intercourse between Egypt, Palestine, and Syria, and therefore the achievements of Field-Marshal Allenby's troops were never sufficiently known to the Egyptian; moreover, the censorship exercised in Egypt was inept, and at times almost savagely ruthless. The Englishman has always regarded somewhat askance the subsidiary organisations of war, such as propaganda, which nevertheless have great use when wisely handled. It was extraordinarily fortunate that Field-Marshal Allenby, whose military skill could not be disputed, showed, when given plenary powers to deal with the Egyptian disturbances, that he was a statesman as well as a soldier, and that he possessed the peculiar blend of firmness and sympathy which most impresses the Eastern mind.

In Egypt many important reforms are long overdue. The existing cosmopolitan legal system, complicated and cumbrous, should be thoroughly overhauled and simplified. Equally

urgent is sanitary reform, for no country can progress unless the conditions of life in it are healthy. At present, in Egypt, they are the reverse. As Dr. Andrew Balfour, the Director of the Wellcome Bureau of Scientific Research, and formerly President of the Egyptian Public Health Commission, has shown, one-third of the children born die in infancy, and only a minority of the remainder grow up into healthy men and women. 'No self-respecting populace can be raised in filthy surroundings.' At present the towns are overcrowded, the villages are unhealthy, and no adequate building schemes exist. The only institution in Egypt at present entitled to grant diplomas for the healing art is the Kasr-el-Aini School of Medicine. No instruction in the diseases of infants and children is given there, and the facilities for the free treatment of such diseases are inadequate except perhaps where eye-diseases are concerned. Of the cities, Cairo is one of the worst in this respect. As Dr Andrew Balfour writes in the *Lancet*:—

'Filth and flies, overcrowding, vermin, infected food and drink, stagnant air, disease and destitution, all are there. Is it any wonder that the Sphinx sits yonder in the desert and gazes with stony and sardonic smile over a city with a death-rate of nearly 40 per 1000, per annum? . . . Public opinion initiates nothing, demands nothing, enforces nothing.'

Certain branches of Egyptian Administration, especially the Ministry of Education, would benefit by overhauling, but not very much improvement can be expected until the authorities concerned grasp the fact that first-rate men cannot be brought out to Egypt for second-rate pay. Certain elements of social life, exaggerated by the influx of Englishmen of all classes during the war, call for immediate attention. The Oriental is very susceptible to a gracious manner and dignity of conduct, and these have been too often lacking, especially in Cairo and Alexandria, amongst both English men and women whom the war gathered for one reason or another in Egypt.

Half way, as it were, between West and East, Egypt became in 1916 a 'clearing house' of armies. After the evacuation of Gallipoli at the beginning of 1916 the greater part of the troops went to Egypt to re-organise and re-equip. Many new units, destined for various theatres of the war, came from India, Australia, and New Zealand for training. Egypt, with its dry,

clear, desert climate became an important centre of instruction in aviation, and large schools and aerodromes were established near Cairo, Alexandria, and Tel-el-Kebir, and upon the wide desert spaces that fringe the Suez Canal. In Egypt was concentrated most of the hospital organisation of the Egyptian Expeditionary Force. Cadet training was carried out on a considerable scale. To Egypt thronged refugees from beyond Jordan. Egypt, moreover, had to house and care for the many thousands of prisoners taken during the Palestine and Syrian campaigns, and in view of their generally degenerate and diseased condition, this was by no means an easy task. Some 100,000 prisoners cannot be fed, housed, clothed, and medically treated for nothing.

In view of the congested state of shipping and the submarine danger in the Mediterranean it was obviously sound policy to buy as much as possible in Egypt and the neighbouring friendly countries. Throughout the war, large quantities of military stores were locally purchased in Egypt.

Thus wealth came to Egypt from official sources. Moreover, the army spent privately, and as soldiers always spend, lavishly, whilst it may be taken for granted that the Cairo and Alexandria shopkeepers were not unduly modest in their prices! It is to be hoped that means may be found to divert some of this wealth directly to public advantage, for Egypt sadly needs more money spent on agriculture, scientific research, and agricultural and industrial education. One result of this access of wealth will be, without doubt, a considerable increase in the number of young Egyptians given an education to fit them for official or professional life. This is a question of extraordinary difficulty. It has always been a cardinal factor of British policy to improve the standard of education of subject communities, and to run the risk while doing so of breeding revolutionary tendencies. The main ambition of the educated young Oriental is to become a Government official of some kind or other, and thus to acquire the dignity and prestige of belonging to the governing order. Whilst it may be perfectly sound policy to encourage this, it is certainly the reverse of useful to continue turning out young men of an official type if no scope is provided for them, and there are not enough jobs to go round. This is undoubtedly the case in Egypt to-day. It was Lord

Cromer's desire, as time went on, gradually to reduce the numbers of British, and to increase that of Egyptians in Government posts, and there are many Egyptians of status and authority who are of opinion that the time is ripe to press on Lord Cromer's policy, and that by doing so we shall materially diminish discontent and revolutionary activity. It must however be borne in mind that, as Lord Cromer well knew, changes of this nature cannot be hastily made without dislocating the machinery of government. Too many Orientals, whilst being happily and quite rightly aware of their abilities, are by no means so clear as to their limitations. Problems of this nature will undoubtedly arise in Palestine and Syria as the structure of modern administration takes shape.

Amongst more serious Egyptians there are probably few real separatists, and their enthusiasm is likely to diminish with the prospect of an era of increased prosperity and greatly enlarged commercial opportunity. But there is still a school of thought which must be reckoned with, and which argues that Egypt is now ready to be left in Egyptian hands, while the Suez Canal might be regarded as a distinctive area to be controlled by England, to whom the free passage of the canal is admittedly vital. Geographically, indeed, the Suez Canal is quite separate from the populous and fertile Nile Delta which is the heart of Egypt.

After his successful campaigns in Palestine and Syria, Field-Marshal Allenby established a provisional civil government called the Occupied Enemy Territory Administration. It was imperative to do this in view of the extreme destitution and disorganisation of the territories from which the Turk had been expelled. This organisation, working of course under reference to martial law, was divided into four areas, east, south, west, and north. Roughly stated, O.E.T.A. South is Palestine; O.E.T.A. North and West, now under French administration, extend from the north and west of Alexandretta down to the northern frontier of Palestine, the Lebanon crest forming the eastern frontier; O.E.T.A. East, with an Arab administration under the astute Emir Feisal, starting from a boundary to the north of Aleppo, stretches along the line of the Medina railway, southwards to the Hedjaz kingdom, with the Lebanon, the lake of Tiberias, and the Dead Sea roughly marking its western

limits. Damascus is the capital of this Arab State, but Aleppo will become its most important commercial centre.

Whatever the final administration of these great areas may be—and we are yet far from the solution of these matters—any subsequent structure of government must be based on the spade work done by O.E.T.A. The corrupt and reactionary system of the Turk fell to pieces as a house of cards before the stress of war, and the conqueror found only muddle, fear, and devastation remaining. The population was impoverished by an oppressor who ruthlessly cut down their olive trees, often their sole means of livelihood, to provide fuel for his military railways, and still further by the blockade to which Turkish possessions had necessarily been subjected by the Allies. All semblance of a system of government had vanished. The O.E.T.A. men, of whom too few knew anything of administrative methods, but all of whom were informed by the true English qualities of common sense and justice, started to pull matters together again, and, despite many mistakes, succeeded in doing so in a manner that is almost beyond praise.*

It would not be good statesmanship, from any point of view, to allow the destiny of Palestine to be determined by purely sentimental reasons. A country can only prosper in the modern world under the freest possible economic conditions, and under a government representative of every section of the community, and impartially attentive to every interest and every channel of progress. To establish Palestine as an artificially organised 'spiritual home' for a certain section of the Jewish race, superimposed upon the existing population, would be to disregard these essential conditions, and the result could not fail to be retrograde. There are many Jews in Palestine to-day who are valuable members of the community, and the number of such Jews might well be increased by carefully scrutinised immigration. But there is as yet no evidence of great eagerness on the part of the leading Jewish houses to assist in the opening up of Palestine, and certainly any effort, made from whatever quarter, to off-load upon that country less

* An interesting account of the financial side of the present administration of Palestine is contained in the official statement of O.E.T.A. South: Estimates of Receipts and Expenditure for 1919-20. Cairo Government Press, 1919.

desirable elements of the Jewish community of which other countries are anxious to be rid, must be at once checked or progress will be out of the question. Palestine does not want to be overrun by Jews, and it is by no means clear that any large number of Jews want to go to Palestine. It would be impossible not to sympathise with the outburst of a deep and widespread desire of a race, for centuries exiled, to return to its historic home; but so far as the Jews are concerned, this has not as yet occurred. Moreover, other races besides the Jewish hold Palestine in peculiar reverence, and may rightly take concern for its future. The soundest statesmanship for Palestine will be to encourage immigration impartially between nationalities, and to make as sure as is humanly possible that each immigrant will prove a useful and progressive member of the community.

Palestine must not hark back in ideals to the past, but must look to the future. Capital is needed, and the brains to use it wisely. There are great possibilities in the undulating agricultural districts from Gaza and Khan Junis, home of Delilah, and northward to Haifa, between mountain and sea. In the hilly districts and the Dead Sea Valley, there may well be notable development in chemicals and metals. It is always somewhat rash to prophesy that a country, standing on the threshold of a new era, will sooner or later produce a great deal more than it needs to meet its own requirements; but Turkish rule has been, from the industrial point of view, so utterly reactionary and apathetic, that certainly the natural resources of Palestine have been as yet largely untapped. It is almost tragic to note the contrast between the luxuriance of nature in many pleasant areas, and the primitive inadequacy of the agricultural implements used since time immemorial by the inhabitants. The lack of towns will be for some time a hindrance; Gaza may never be resuscitated, and Jaffa, although its wine and other industries will give it importance, has no harbour worth mentioning. Haifa, already developing under British enterprise, should become a useful seaport, and its situation from many points of view is admirable.

Jerusalem will remain, at least for some years, a city aloof. It is the religious centre of the civilised world. That is privilege enough. It has no manufactures. Its inhabitants toil not,

neither do they spin. They live on charity, tourist traffic, and the sale of religious souvenirs of olive wood and Bethlehem mother-of-pearl. The moral effect of this kind of life is not perhaps good, but great difficulties of transport would attend any effort to develop manufacture in a city so isolated from any feasible trade channels as Jerusalem on its lonely heights. And after all, it seems fitting that one city in the world should remain separate from the traffic of commerce, a temple of reverence and awe. It would be well if there could be expelled from this incomparable Jerusalem of to-day all trace of the petty intrigue and meanness of outlook and method which diminish its charm, and if in their stead could arise an austere tradition to influence all those who will now throng to the Holy Place.

Such portions of Syria as are now definitely passing under French control will assuredly be well administered, and with a keen eye to all kinds of commercial and industrial development. The French system of colonial administration, as applied, for instance, in Algiers and Tunis, is very different from ours; but it is impossible to dispute its alertness and orderliness, or to fail to recognise the extraordinarily keen insight into the Eastern temperament which the French possess. Methods of government are racial matters; there is no hard and fast law. It may be roughly said that the English plunge blithely and painstakingly into the task of administration, imposing their own standards of justice, and leading their own English lives, in whatever environment, without considering it necessary to mingle much with the people they are governing, but allowing as full rein as possible to all such indigenous methods and customs as do not seem to them harmful to the right development of the body politic. The French, on the other hand, with patient persistence, superpose their own precise and admirably organised administrative system, and in addition penetrate the subject community, so far as they can, with their own ideas and methods of life, even to the smallest details. He would be a bold man who would say which method of colonisation has proved most successful in the modern world.

But the problem of Syria is at its heart the problem of the Arab. Indeed, every issue in the Middle East is subordinate

to this. For the Arab does not change. 'As the East is one 'and unalterable, so the Arab is one and unalterable; at heart 'he is the same man, and for hundreds of years has been the 'same, whether he come from the Hedjaz, Damascus, or Tunis.' It is as yet too early to estimate finally the value of that policy which brought the Arab of the Hedjaz into our war with the Turk, by inflaming him with the prospect of renewed domination over a spacious and wealthy region, extending from his home in Arabia to Damascus itself. A glance at the map will show how urgently important it was, during the war, to secure the right flank of our immensely long line of communications through the Sinai Peninsula, Palestine, and Syria, especially as the Turks still held Arabia in strength. To obtain and organise the co-operation of the Hedjaz Arabs the right man was found in the unassuming, but now almost legendary young archæologist, Thomas Lawrence, one of those men who have appeared from time to time in British history, men able to merge their personality almost entirely in that of the East, to be of it correctly and unfailingly in every detail of their daily lives, and thus, by virtue of similarity and dissimilarity strangely blended, to obtain immense influence over Eastern races. The full significance of the engagements then entered into, as binding upon the British Empire, was probably not realised by those responsible for their acceptance. Our ministers were then absorbed by the needs of the military situation. The cogency of these engagements emerged later, and constitutes one of the most difficult of all the many social and political problems left by the war.

The Arab was brought in as a factor in the war, to the advantage of enlightened and humane government, and contributed somewhat to the defeat of the Turk. Yet he is infinitely more reactionary in ideas than the Turk, and civilisation, as we understand the term, means much less to him. The Turk has some knowledge of what the machinery and method of a modern civilised State should be, even if he be too callous and cynical to employ them to the advantage of subject peoples. The Arab has none of this knowledge. Largely nomadic still at heart, he is entirely incapable of governing a modern community. His best qualities are amply in evidence whilst he remains in his own environment, and under his own accustomed

conditions; there his frugality and austerity of life, the respect of youth for age, often finely appear. In contact with the closer responsibilities of an organised community he has already shown too often that his weaker and more primitive qualities take charge; he is bombastic, reckless, brutal. To hand over to the Arab, without more than a few fastidiously phrased mandates, an extensive region, including much of the wealth of Syria, and thus perhaps to cut off Mesopotamia from direct contact with Europe, would be a disastrous step. Those who have already come in contact with Arab administrative methods, during and since the war, know well into what a morass of muddle, pillage, and cruelty such a State would slide. The whole splendid achievement of the Egyptian Expeditionary Force would be nullified, and British prestige would suffer a heavy blow.

Finally, a word remains to be said about future means of transport in the Middle East, for when once the goods are produced, commerce asks how best and quickest they can be brought to market. Egypt is well served. The Egyptian State Railways showed during the war marked elasticity and boldness in coping with emergencies, and the recently established Egyptian Ministry of Communications should prove of great value to Egyptian progress. The Palestine military railway, under some new organisation, must be maintained, since traffic with Egypt will necessarily be heavy until a direct trade route is in working order into Haifa. If the swing bridge be abandoned at Kantara, a tunnel beneath the canal should replace it without much difficulty. A somewhat flimsy and tortuous system of railways, of varying gauges, feeds Northern Palestine and Syria. The long line of the Medina railway, which traverses the sparsely populated areas east of the Jordan Valley and the Red Sea, may eventually prove of value, if the extension of Arab authority can be adjusted to modern requirements. Syria is at present most inadequately equipped as regards railways, in comparison with her great natural resources, and the first task of a new administration must be to build them.

The Baghdad railway will assuredly be the swift land link between Europe and Asia. Here lies the great economic prospect of the Middle East, more perhaps than in an organisation of water transport by Tigris and Euphrates, or even the

development of the Levantine ports. Soon after the British occupation of Syria and Cilicia, construction work on the Baghdad railway was vigorously undertaken, and many sections of the line were brought into use. This system actually begins at Konia, in the heart of Asia Minor, where, by means of the Anatolian railway, it connects with Constantinople. From Constantinople to Aleppo the distance is some 850 miles. From Aleppo, the line proceeds to Jerablus on the Euphrates, and thence by Nisibin to the important centre of Mosul on the Tigris; thence southwards to Baghdad and to Basra. The distance from Aleppo to Baghdad is about 650 miles. Carry the imagination further, and we may reasonably picture, under the new political arrangements between Great Britain and Persia, the extension of the Baghdad railway to Teheran, and thence to Quetta and India. That done—and the conception has its grandeur—travel 'overland' between London and Calcutta should be a matter of less than a fortnight.

LINDSAY BASHFORD.

INDUSTRIALISM IN WALES

FROM whatever standpoint we may regard the organic life of the Principality, it is patent that it has outlived its traditional period of domestic, social, political, and economic life, and that it can never again be subject to the same customs or economic laws that it enjoyed of old. In no respect, except geographically, is the Wales of to-day the Wales delineated by George Borrow. The Welsh people have undergone a transformation from a small, widely-scattered pastoral or agricultural people of practically identical aims, methods, and conditions, to a cosmopolitan people, crowded into towns and industrial centres, with varied forms of employment, and diverse aims and conditions of life. When the Crown lawyers of Queen Elizabeth had to deal with the question of Welsh tenure, farming was almost the only available avenue for the investment of what little capital the Welsh had to spare. The land was then the source from which the nation drew its strength, its domestic virtues and stability. But the whole aspect of agricultural Wales changed when industrial Wales came into existence. When commerce began to flourish, agriculture declined. It is *industrial*, not rural Wales, that has been the main force in determining the social conditions of the Wales of to-day.

It is not intended here to imply that the agricultural resources of Wales were at any time great, or that the Welsh peasantry had any pretensions to scientific agriculture. Indeed, it would not be too much to say that the Wales of the past was the poorest, and in some ways the most backward, country in Europe. Commerce was in a low condition; no newspapers could exist; people got their news from ballad singers at fairs and markets, and from stocking-sellers and flannel-weavers, who made their rounds twice a year, about May and September. Political feeling was well-nigh unknown; literature, except the purely denominational form of it, was dormant. The pulpit was practically the only sphere in which a Welshman could distinguish himself. Education was of the most primitive kind.

But since the discovery of the mineral wealth of the southern

part of the Principality, a vast economic change has been in progress, in rapid stages, from the beginning of the nineteenth century to our own day. We have witnessed the capitalisation not only of the mining industry, but also of commerce and manufactures. Large fortunes have been amassed, and are still in process of being amassed by individuals, and by companies and large combines. Side by side with this development of large fortunes, there has been a very great general advance among the artisan and merchant and industrial classes in numbers, means of subsistence, and wealth, which has had a material effect on the social and political progress of Wales. Nothing could be more interesting than the study of the effect of the opening of the Welsh coalfields and ironworks in the first half of the nineteenth century, upon the mental characteristics of the Welsh people, their literature, their ambitions, their mode of living, and their system of education. It would not be too much to say that if the opening of the South Wales collieries and ironworks had been deferred until the beginning of this century, there would be no Intermediate Schools or University Colleges in Wales to-day. The discovery of the mineral wealth of Wales may be very properly described as the discovery of a new world; it is the most important event that has taken place in the history of the Principality since the days of the annexation. The Welsh coalfields are the largest in Europe, and, with the exception of those of Nova Scotia, contain a greater vertical thickness of strata than any coalfields in the world. Welsh steam coal is vital to the British navy, and to our mercantile marine, because it is smokeless, and gives greater speed. Its special value to the nation was first brought to the attention of Parliament, and of the public, by Richard Fothergil, one of the Members for the Merthyr Boroughs, in a speech delivered in August 1870. In this speech he gave effective publicity to the important message which Admiral Napier had sent to the Government:—'Supply me with Welsh 'steam coal or I cannot be answerable for the safety of the fleet.'

The development of Welsh steam coal has necessarily made Wales a much more important factor in the economic and political life of Great Britain. It has also, in recent years, elevated the standard of living among the Welsh people. In 1851 Henry Austin Bruce (afterwards Lord Aberdare), then

stipendiary magistrate for Merthyr, said in a lecture that the destitution, ignorance, and immorality which prevailed in the Welsh coalfields, and in the industrial districts generally, were not due to any want of material prosperity:—'I know no other 'part of the Empire,' said he, 'in which, one year with another, 'wages range so high, food and fuel are so cheap and plentiful, 'and workmen's dwelling-houses so substantial and convenient.'

There was a time in the history of the Welsh mining community, as well as in that of other industries, when the relation between employer and employed was of a somewhat friendly character, partly because it was more personal, partly because the interests of the one were largely considered to be identical with the interests of the other. A perusal of the vernacular press during the middle of the nineteenth century and afterwards goes to show how strong and widespread was the feeling among the workers generally that the interests of labour and capital were identical, and how essential it was that men and masters should co-operate in order to secure the best and fullest results. After Crawshay Bailey had built his first forge in connexion with his ironworks in Monmouthshire, in the early part of the nineteenth century, he found himself at the end of his resources. 'I have nothing,' he said, 'to depend 'upon but the providence of God, and the sympathy and co-'operation of my workers.' When, at last, he succeeded in making the works pay, and in amassing considerable wealth, he never failed to show his gratitude to the workers who had made his success possible by generously contributing to every cause in which they were interested.

About the year 1870 strikes began and then lock-outs. They were chiefly local, there being no Union or Federation as there is to-day. Since the organisation of the South Wales Miners' Federation, there have been many critical periods in the history of the mining industry, though none comparable to the present. In proportion as governmental authority, like every other authority, has declined, the power wielded by the Welsh miners has increased. In their advancement we see the rise of a new power in the State, more immediately influential, and with greater potentialities than purely political power, or the power represented by Welsh ecclesiasticism in any or all of its forms. The whole movement maintains itself

through the prospects held out by socialism of substantial gains for the workers if they hold together and persist in their demands. It would not be too much to say that socialism, as preached to-day, has profoundly modified the orientation of the ideas and sentiments of almost every class in Welsh society. It has its advocates and special pleaders in our Welsh University Colleges, in our secondary schools, and among the teaching staff. Some of the most ardent protagonists of socialism, and of the Welsh industrial movement, are to be found among Welsh ministers of religion. There are extreme men among them, who affect to believe that there is a good deal to be said in favour of the principles or theories that underlie the Bolshevist movement. Lowell called Christ 'the first real Democrat that the world ever saw,' but some Welsh Nonconformists go further, and openly say 'that Christ was the first Bolshevist that the world ever saw,' forgetting, or wilfully ignoring the fact, that He forbade His followers to use violence to His enemies.

Among contributory causes to the growth of socialism, not the least important is the development of the social sense, or the sense of kinship, among the workers, especially among the miners, partly through the influence of the South Wales Miners' Federation, partly through the consciousness of what the workers allege that they have suffered together in their struggles with capitalism. This social sense, or sense of kinship, has been more widely and largely developed among the Welsh mining community than among any other section of industrialists in Wales, or perhaps in any other part of the country. This goes far to explain the fact that Wales has been the storm-centre of the industrial strikes that have disturbed the common peace during recent years.

Side by side with the development of this social sense, there has been a loss of individual liberty. It may be doubted if any autocrat ever imposed such restrictions on the individual's personal liberty as the South Wales Miners' Federation has imposed on the personal liberty of the individual miner. It is not long since the creed of the 'individual right' of every man to dispose of his labour power, by voluntary contract on any condition agreed to by himself, was accepted as being ethically and industrially sound. It is still held by a small minority on

the ground that the wage earner is a free man in a free country, and the owner of his own labour power. But the miners in the mass have put their heads together to deprive the individual wage earner of this freedom, on the ground that he cannot be permitted to do anything that may be considered by them to be injurious to his fellow-worker, and they have endeavoured to get this prohibition incorporated in statute law. The point of view of the majority is that even free labour in a free country requires the strong arm of the law to protect it, not only against the capitalist, but against itself. Recently the refusal of *one* miner to join the Miners' Federation caused eighteen hundred workmen at the Fernhill Collieries, Treherbert, to stop work. The loss of output was estimated at about 1300 tons a day. This is the effect of the policy which has been adopted by the South Wales Miners' Federation. It seems to consider what it calls the 'abuse of freedom' a much greater evil than the denial of freedom. Its code of industrial morals limits individual action in every thinkable way; it inflicts every form of ridicule and contempt on the individual miner who declines to join its Union, in the hope of making his life unbearable. It even goes beyond what the civil law allows, yet with impunity.

The development of this social sense, or sense of kinship, is also responsible for what is termed 'the sympathetic strike.' If one section of labour strikes, other sections say, 'They are 'fighting for our rights as well as for their own; we are interested 'in the conflict they are waging; we must down tools in support 'of their cause.' It matters not what the merits of the dispute may be; the fact that one section of Labour has a dispute with Capital, or with the Government, is enough to warrant active interference on its behalf, on the theory that no one class of workmen liveth unto itself alone. If the railway strike had continued a few weeks longer, the Welsh miners would certainly have taken sympathetic action.

Herein is also the secret of the effort to exact for unskilled labour (which occupies so large a space in the field of industrial labour in Wales) greater equality with skilled labour. The object is to improve the environment of every grade of worker; to lift the lower, so far as possible, to the level of the higher, in wages, hours of labour, and conditions. There has been nothing like it in Wales religiously or nationally. Wales is divided nationally, religiously, and educationally, and these divisions

permeate the whole of Welsh contemporary literature. What is termed 'Welsh Nationalism' is founded on purely racial and linguistic lines; it is, therefore, separatist in spirit and effect. But Welsh industrial nationalism is founded on cosmopolitan lines; it teaches that the interest of one section of workers in any country is identical with the interest of other workers in other countries.

Coincident with the enormous growth of the economic and political power which the Welsh miners in their corporate capacity have acquired, there has been a corresponding increase in the value of manual labour relatively to other forms of labour. In particular, there is a growing disparity between the value of educational labour and manual labour. While every effort is being made to enhance the manual worker's wages, there is no similar effort being made on behalf of the professional or lettered classes, whose incomes are meagre and precarious. They are left to their fate, which has been, during recent years, a distressing one. They suffer in silence, and their difficulties are not generally known. If the cost of living increases, the miner gets a corresponding rise in wages. He also still gets his coal at the pre-war low rate, while the middle and professional classes have to pay practically double. The injustice of this becomes more apparent, when we take into consideration the fact that the cost of producing or preparing manual labour power is infinitesimal, when compared with the cost of producing or preparing educational labour power.

The effects of this growing disparity are striking. Not less than fifty Nonconformist ministers in one Welsh county alone, have, during the last three years, abandoned the ministry, and returned to secular life in order to secure a living wage. A few have gone back to the mines; others would go, if they could pocket their dignity. There are ministers who have had a fairly good education, some of them possessing University degrees, who preach to congregations in which there are men of the manual worker's class, whose income is double, in some cases treble their own.

There are many impecunious but frugal parents, living in small cottages in the counties of Cardigan and Carmarthen, who have come to feel that they have placed their sons, as well as themselves, in a false position. Being ambitious to educate their sons for the clerical and other professions, they stinted themselves of almost every comfort, and now find that, in the

majority of cases, their sons have a struggle to live, with no surplus cash to put in the family pool, and are far worse off than the uneducated miner. There is general regret at the sacrifice made for such disappointing results. It is not uncommon in Wales nowadays to hear educated men, who have spent a lifetime in the teaching profession, saying, with a tinge of bitterness, that if they had a dozen sons they would not now incur the expense of preparing and educating one of them for the teaching or clerical profession. It has become evident that the influence of deep religious feeling, and of exalted intellectual energy, which has been of such incomparable importance in moulding individual character, and in shaping and directing national thought in Wales, has weakened in proportion to the development of industrial life.

The following specific examples, taken from the pay-sheets of representative steam coal collieries in the South Wales coalfields, for the week ending 18th October 1919, are instructive, as showing what the collier earns per ton of coal.

Example 1.—A collier received £4. 14s. 2d. for producing 3 tons 12 cwt., or at the rate of about 26s. 1d. per ton.

Example 2.—A collier producing only 2 tons 2 cwt. of coal received £4. 16s. 3d., or at the rate of £2. 5s. 8½d. per ton.

Example 3.—A collier producing 10 tons 2 cwt. received a net wage of £13. 4s. 1d., or at the rate of about 26s. 1d. per ton.

The following figures, for the same week, show what the collier earns per diem :—

A.—Output, 12 tons 17 cwt.; gross wage, £13. 4s. 4d., less £3. 6s. paid to assistant; net wage, £9. 18s. 4d., or 33s. per day.

B.—Output (two men), 29 tons 10 cwt.; gross wage, £21. 7s., less £2. os. 6d. paid to boys; net wage, £19. 6s. 6d., or average wage per man, 32s. 2d. per day.

C.—Output, 18 tons 2 cwt.; gross wage, £13. 14s. 8d., less £3. 16s. 6d. to assistant; net wage, £9. 18s. 2d., or 33s. per day.

D.—Output, 27 tons 6 cwt.; gross wage, £16. 18s. 6d., less £3. 1s. 6d. paid to boy; net wage, £13. 17s., or 46s. 2d. per day.

E.—Gross output, 26 tons 14 cwt; gross wage, £11. 14s. 6d., less £1. 19s. 6d. to boy; net wage, £9. 15s. 6d., or 32s. 7d. per day.

In Wales a shorter working day does not mean a working day of more intense labour, but rather less; it has resulted in a lessened production per man. It does not seem to occur to the men that the same quantity of coal, or the same necessities of life, which were formerly produced under a longer working day, cannot be produced under a shorter working day, without

accelerating the rate of production within the given time. And the blunt truth is, that this decrease in production, and its effect upon other industries, does not trouble the average Welsh miner. The extremists—the only leaders who really count—rather rejoice at any injury which their policy may inflict on other interests, which they class in the lump as capitalistic.

The objection of the Welsh miner to the introduction of machinery is also perfectly explicable to those who understand his mental temperament. He thinks that the use of machinery means a lower wage and a lower standard of living. He is not only a mistrustful but a complex personality. His psychology is not without affinity with that of the Welsh farmer; neither has been trained or educated on the scientific side; indeed, science among the Welsh people is as yet in its infancy. It is to the preference of the Welsh farmer for traditional methods that we must attribute the fact that the best and fullest results have hitherto been impossible in Welsh agriculture. For instance, the Welsh farmer has had a strong prejudice against the use of fertilisers, partly because he does not know how to use them, partly because, as he thinks, they produce weeds, as if there were no weeds on Welsh farms before fertilisers were introduced.

A certain enterprising Welshman, after a highly successful career in America, decided to return to his native village in the heart of Cardiganshire, and to take up farming on scientific lines. Knowing what the use of machinery had accomplished in America on the land and in the coal mines, how it had increased production, reduced the cost, and saved time, he bought an American hay-mowing machine, the first of its kind in Wales. But the farmers of the district were so annoyed at the innovation that they refused to speak to him; they even went so far as to put pegs in the field at night in order to destroy the machine. As it has been with the Welsh farmer, so it is with the Welsh miner. Nor do the labour leaders encourage any improvement upon the present labour processes, because they do not wish to do anything to increase output under the capitalistic system, which they are pledged to destroy. The Welsh miner is a Trade Unionist first, and only in the second place a patriot.

To confess the truth, we know of no means whereby the existing suspicion and mistrust of Capital on the part of Labour, which is so intensely bitter in Wales, can be removed. The policy of the leaders has been, and is, to keep the miners in a state of

rebellion by representing the capitalists as a tyrannical and a decadent class, who should make room for the workers. Being devoid of any knowledge of the history of capitalism, or of the part it has played in the promotion of civilisation, and in the world's progress towards equal rights and liberties, they cannot realise that it was a force on the side of freedom, and a means for enabling men to break the old chains of feudalism. Capitalism they regard as the taproot of all industrial evil. Their economics take us right back into medieval times. They use the term 'interest' as if it were synonymous with the term 'usury,' as it was understood and applied at one period in Europe, that is, as a thing to be condemned as altogether immoral. Before the sixteenth century, 'usury' was regarded as an exaction for which the borrower had received no equivalent, from which at any rate he had derived no benefit.* The economic teachers of the miners ask, 'When did capital produce anything?' 'It plays,' they say, 'no part in production;' 'it is not entitled to 'any share in the products of the mining or of any industry.' 'The 'owners are in the business for their own sordid and selfish ends.'

In order to propagate these and other spurious ideas and theories, speakers have been trained, and are paid a larger remuneration than many ministers of religion in the mining valleys receive. These ideas are also propagated by means of books and pamphlets, which are sold in large quantities, especially if they be of the advanced kind. Nor has the emotional element in human nature been ignored. Processions and mass meetings always work upon the imagination of the people and communicate ideas by the contagion of sympathy. The impulse to great changes has been constantly derived from demonstrations of this kind. The remarkable thing is, that while this propaganda has been in progress, the mine owners have been like pilots asleep in a storm. They have only just awakened, perhaps too late, to the realities of the situation.

J. Vyrnwy Morgan.

* In the following passage from "The Merchant of Venice," Act I., Scene iii., interest is contrasted with usance, and treated as the greater sin:—'He lends out money gratis and brings down the rate of usance here with us in Venice. If I can catch him once upon the hip, I will feed fat the ancient grudge I bear him. He hates our sacred nation; and he rails, on me, my bargains and my well-won thrift, which he calls interest.'

THE LEGEND OF 'PERFIDE ALBION'

1. **Traditions of British Statesmanship.** By the Hon. ARTHUR D. ELLIOT. Constable & Co. 1918.
2. **British Foreign Policy in Europe.** By H. E. EGERTON. Macmillan.
3. **A Century of British Foreign Policy.** By G. P. GOOCH and J. H. B. MASTERMAN. George Allen and Unwin.

IN the remarkable Memorandum addressed to the Chancellor von Bethmann-Hollweg on 30th July 1914, the Emperor William II. declared that, in spite of all efforts to prevent it, the celebrated 'encirclement' of Germany, plotted by King Edward VII., had become an accomplished fact; and a situation had been created which gave England the desired pretext for destroying Germany, 'with the hypocritical semblance of justice 'presented by helping France to maintain the notorious balance 'of power in Europe.' All these machinations, he said, must now be unsparingly laid bare, and 'the mask of Christian peaceable-'ness openly and violently torn from them in public.' Finally, the whole Mohammedan world must be incited to 'a savage uprising 'against this hated, lying, unscrupulous nation of hucksters.'*

At first sight this language suggests that the Kaiser's mind had become unhinged; but, if so, there was method in his madness. There was even something more; for it is possible to detect in this insensate outpouring of hatred against England a note of sincerity, and of a conviction that is more than the outcome of mere individual prejudice. And, indeed, as will presently be shown, the Kaiser's language was not his own, but a mere echo of what he had been taught as a boy, and of what all other German boys of his day and generation had been taught, about the character of England and the selfishness and unscrupulousness of her foreign policy. There is plentiful evidence that in using this language the Emperor was at one with his people, whose long pent-up hatred of England burst forth in an amazing torrent of vituperation the moment the flood-gates were opened by the British declaration of war.†

* See *The Times*, 29th November 1919.

† See, *e.g.*, 'Wehe dir England!' an anthology of 117 hymns of hate. Leipzig. Third Edition. 1915.

A manifestation so unbridled and so disreputable came with a shock of surprise to the English. They would have been less surprised had they known that for two generations past the German people had been methodically taught that England, as a Power, had always been mercenary, selfish, and cowardly; that she had consistently abused her insular position, her policy having always been to set the continental peoples by the ears in order that, herself safe behind her 'moat,' she might be able to profit by the exhaustion of her rivals to extend her colonial empire, and secure a virtual monopoly of the world's wealth. It has to be remembered, too, that this legend—for legend it is—has been in the past by no means confined to Germany. Before the war it was equally current in France, and it is only since the war that French historians have begun to suspect the fundamental misconception underlying the traditional estimate of *la perfide Albion.* Even with the object-lessons of the war before them, not all have been able to rid themselves of their inherited prejudices. M. Edouard Driault, for instance, in a volume published in 1917, at the very time when the British blockade was forcing Germany to loosen the grip that was strangling France, declared that 'It 'is certain that Napoleon (in the proclamation of the Continental 'Blockade) represented right, strict right, natural right against 'the indefensible misuse which England made of her supremacy 'at sea.'* It is, then, perhaps not surprising that the legend of the peculiar unscrupulousness and hypocrisy of British foreign policy should have been widely accepted on the Continent, since the selfishness and perfidy of England were the stock themes of both French and German publicists.

It is worth while to inquire into the origins of a legend which has had so profound and so terrible an effect upon international relations. Certainly it had no existence during the greater part of the eighteenth century. In the opinion of the continental political theorists of that age, the function of

* 'Tilsit,' p. 50. Compare also the language of the well known journalist, M. Herbette, as reported in *The Times* of 10th December last: 'What is now going on in Germany,' he wrote, 'gives them a foretaste of what would happen if England's policy were to return to the only too well known tradition of making no definite engagements with anyone, and systematically setting all the peoples of the Continent against one another.'

England in the European States system was wholly beneficial, as making not for war, but for stability and peace. She did not escape accusations of perfidy. In those days nobody could; for such accusations were part of the conventional armament of diplomatic warfare, and were scattered about by none more profusely than by Frederick the Great, himself the most complete exponent and master of the art of diplomatic chicane. But nobody took these accusations seriously; still less did anyone dream of placing England in a category by herself as the perfidious nation *par excellence*. To have done so would have been too ridiculous; and the political world, very small and very select, had still a sense of humour. Whence, then, the legend?

The legend blossomed in the France of the Revolution; but the seed had been sown long before by Montesquieu, when he laid it down that republican institutions are founded upon virtue. The Fathers of the American Republic, disciples of Montesquieu, accepted and proclaimed this principle; but, being men of affairs, they realised that it represented an ideal rather than a fact. The founders of the first French Republic, on the other hand, recognised no such limitation. For them republicanism was not only established in virtue, it was the natural outcome of virtue, and the sole final proof of its existence. It followed that all who opposed the Republic opposed virtue; and since, from the moment the Convention resumed the traditional French policy of aggression in the Netherlands, Great Britain became the most implacable enemy of the Republic, it further followed that English statesmen were of all the most unvirtuous. In his interminable speech on morality and religion, delivered at the Feast of the Supreme Being on the 7th May 1794, Robespierre anticipated the judgments passed in recent years by Germans on British statesmanship :—

> 'Vous connaissez ce mot ingénu du Cardinal de Richelieu, écrit dans son testament politique, que les rois doivent s'abstenir avec grand soin de se servir des gens de probité, parcequ'ils ne peuvent en tirer parti. . . . C'est en Angleterre que le machiavellisme a poussé cette doctrine royale au plus haut degré de perfection.'

A few months earlier, Barère, in the Convention, had delivered a vitriolic attack on the British Government which even anticipated the very phrases used by German writers in their verbal onslaughts during the war :—

'C'est ce Gouvernement qui emploie les trésors de l'Inde pour asservir l'Europe, les bienfaits de la commerce pour perdre la liberté, les avantages des communications sociales pour corrompre les hommes, et les tributs du peuple pour faire égorger les Français.'

And this legend of *la perfide Albion*, propagated under the Republic in innumerable speeches, official documents, books, and pamphlets, was too valuable an asset for Napoleon to allow it to perish under the Empire. It was he who sneered at the British as 'a nation of shop-keepers,' and he employed a host of hired scribblers to spread the legend throughout the Continent.

It might have been supposed that in Germany the legend would not have survived the comradeship-in-arms of Waterloo and the final proofs given by Great Britain of the essentially 'European' character of her policy. But, as a matter of fact, it survived more strongly in Germany even than in France, which had good reason to realise, in 1815, that British policy was neither so unscrupulous nor so unfriendly to herself as she had imagined. It survived in Germany because, during the negotiations of 1814 and 1815, British statesmen realised in the insatiable appetite of Prussia a danger to the world's peace against which precautions had to be taken, and successfully resisted demands which included the dismemberment of France, the restoration to Germany of Alsace and Lorraine, and the creation of a mighty German Confederation to which both Switzerland and the Netherlands were to be invited to attach themselves. Prussian patriots could not forgive the part played by Great Britain in saving France from disruption and ruin, and they ascribed the moderation of her attitude to motives wholly mean. In a memorandum addressed to the Emperor Alexander I., the great Prussian soldier Gneisenau gave voice to the general sentiment:—

'If the frontier of France remains unaltered, it will be generally said that England desires to throw the Continent into new convulsions, so that time may not be given for the continental countries to defend themselves against British commercial policy.'

This was not merely the splenetic outburst of a soldier who believed himself about to be cheated of the spoils of victory; it was the deliberate expression of a received opinion, and as such it is quoted by Treitschke, in his 'Deutsche Geschichte,' with entire approval, and enlarged on by him with characteristic venom and characteristic contempt for historic probabilities:—

'Filled with moral indignation, comfortably patting their well-stuffed pockets, the Tories spoke about Prussian poverty and greed; their envy of Germany was so detestably plain that even the good-natured Prussian patriots at length came clearly to understand the true character of British commercial policy; and many of those who had been for years admirers of English magnanimity, now expressed an adverse judgment.'

In writing thus, Treitschke was but carrying on a tradition which had lived on, more or less obscured, in Prussia. Even King Frederick William IV., whose conviction of the spiritual affinities of Prussia and England found expression in the Jerusalem bishopric, accepted it. 'England,' he wrote in 1840 to Count Friedrich Wilhelm von Bismarck, 'is dependent upon her mercantile interests, and knows no other law for her policy.'* But though Treitschke did not create the legend, he did more than any other man to give it a wide currency in modern Germany. His influence during the critical formative period of the new German Empire was enormous, and until his death, in 1896, he used this influence to destroy the admiration surviving among German Liberals for England and English institutions, in order to establish in its place the worship of the Prussian militarist ideal. In season and out of season, in his historical works, in his professorial lectures, in the pages of the *Preussische Jahrbücher*, and doubtless also as the future Emperor's tutor, he played endless variations on the theme of England's 'shamelessness' (*die Unverschämtheit Englands*). The idea of an alliance with England, mooted in Germany at the time of the colonial agreements in 1891, he rejected with scorn. The British democracy, he said, was incapable of understanding the value of alliances as Pitt had understood it;† and, in any case, their alliance would be useless, and worse.

'For there exist no means by which the honest, serious co-operation of England can be secured. Were a formal alliance with England really concluded, her activities in furtherance of the objects of the alliance would be as lame and as laming as they have always been. All the greater would be the claim of England to a share in the prize of victory. . . . The democratisation of England is the axe laid at the root of her world position. England might be a desirable ally if the English people were still capable of self-sacrificing efforts and heroic actions under great leadership. But of such efforts no democracy is capable, because it lacks the necessary far-sightedness, and the English

* 'Auch ein Bismarck.' *Preussische Jahrbücher*, 66, p. 384.

† *Preussische Jahrbücher*, 66. July to December, 1890, p. 94.

democracy least of all, because in it the natural shortness of sight has been aggravated into blindness by huckster's egoism (*Krämeregoismus*).' *

Such is the legend of *la perfide Albion*, as developed in the France of the Revolution and adopted and expanded by German rancour. If it gained so wide a currency abroad, the fault is doubtless in some measure our own. The charge of hypocrisy brought against our statesmen has derived some weight from the fact that, in order to carry with them a people very ignorant of the essential factors of international relations, and at the same time very sentimental and well meaning, they have acquired the habit, if not of exaggerating, at least of putting in the foreground the altruistic aspects of their policies, and keeping in the background the purely British interests involved. It is not altogether surprising that the continental peoples, jealously watching the vast and rapid expansion of our Empire and our trade, should have been as troubled by this attitude as Alice was in Wonderland by the heartfelt sympathy expressed by the walrus for the oysters.

Moreover, in our characteristic contempt for professorial methods, we took no adequate measures to meet the anti-British propaganda before the war by any reasoned apology for British statesmanship. Materials for such an apology existed in rich abundance; but, so far as they were published, they were scattered in memoirs of statesmen and in collections of State papers, or only partly exploited in general histories, while the vast mass of materials preserved in the Record Office had, so far as the latter half of the nineteenth century is concerned, lain wholly neglected. Before the war a history of British foreign policy, based even on the published materials, did not exist. In other words, there was no means by which a person of ordinary intelligence, at home or abroad, could obtain a complete and correct impression of the historic attitude of this country towards Europe and the world at large, without an amount of study for which few have the time or the inclination.

This want has now been in some measure supplied. Of the three books whose titles are placed at the head of this article indeed, none is, or pretends to be, a complete history of British foreign policy; for even Mr. Egerton's work, though far the fullest and most elaborately documented of the three, is con-

* *Preussische Jahrbücher*, 67. 1891, p. 575.

fessedly a *pièce d'occasion*, written to meet a pressing need of the moment; and he has rightly not thought it necessary for his purpose to go beyond the published materials. Mr. Arthur Elliot's suggestive volume, written from the point of view of one brought up in the earlier traditions of Gladstonian Liberalism, is mainly concerned with a defence of British statesmanship during the period of which he has personal knowledge, and as such it has a practical value; but only the first chapter is devoted to the general lines of British foreign policy before the last two decades of the nineteenth century. The little book of Messrs. Gooch and Masterman is frankly intended for popular consumption, a fact which by no means detracts from its importance. The significance of the three taken together is that, written as they are from different points of view and with different objects, they all give the same account of the general motives of British policy in the past, and the same general impression of its character.

None of them makes the mistake of claiming for British statesmanship an impossible standard of altruism. But to judge it by the occasional apparent contradiction between its profession and its performance would be as unfair as it would be to judge American statesmanship by the tragic collapse of the over-lofty moral platform on which President Wilson took his stand at the Peace Conference. To judge at all we must have clearly in our minds what are the moral obligations of statesmen towards their own people and the world outside. We may dismiss as out of date and fundamentally unsound the Machiavellian doctrine that the State is above morality and has no obligation save to itself, a doctrine which, to all intents and purposes, was that of Imperial Germany. But, as Mr. Egerton once more points out, the statesman is primarily the trustee of the interests of his own country, and he has no moral right to sacrifice these interests to the pursuit of purely altruistic ends. On the other hand, he is equally false to his trust if he fail to realise that the interests of his country are, in the long run, inseparable from those of the whole community of nations of which it forms a part, and that a purely selfish policy must end in disaster. It is by the measure of its faithfulness to this double obligation that British statesmanship in its relations with the Continent must be judged.

No impartial student of these relations can fail to see that, whatever there may be to criticise in detail, the judgment must, on the whole, be favourable. It is true that from time to time England has been content 'to revolve in her own orbit,' sometimes with disturbing effect on the European system. But, sooner or later, an irresistible force has drawn her back into her predestined place as what Montesquieu called the *puissance exécutrice* of Europe and the guardian of its liberties. Even Mr. Gladstone, though of all British statesmen the one most disposed to avoid 'continental entanglements,' realised the existence of this force, namely, the peculiar responsibility placed upon Great Britain by the accident of her geographical position and the unassailable power which has been its outcome. 'I do not believe,' he wrote in 1869, 'that England will 'ever or can be unfaithful to her great tradition, or can forswear 'her interest in the common transactions and the general 'interests of Europe.'*

The most striking thing in the history of British foreign policy is the almost unbroken continuity of this 'great tradition.' Fundamentally the principles governing the relations of Great Britain with the Continent have remained unchanged for centuries. They remain unchanged, because they are the outcome of the unalterable conditions of our island Empire. When, on the 17th February 1800, Tierney asked Pitt to state in one sentence, without ifs and buts, the object of the war with France, Pitt replied, 'I know not whether I can do it in one 'sentence, but in one word I can tell him that it is *security* '. . . security against a danger which in degree and extent has 'never been equalled; against a danger which threatened all 'the nations of the earth.' More than a hundred years earlier, in 1694, Halifax had laid down the prime conditions of this security:—

> 'To the question, what shall we do to be saved in this world, there is no other answer than this, Look to your moat. The first article of an Englishman's creed must be that he believeth in the sea. Without that there needeth no general council to pronounce him incapable of salvation here.' †

Halifax, indeed, elaborated the theme in language which anticipated the sentiment of that classic hymn, 'Rule Britannia,'

* Morley, 'Life of Gladstone,' ii., p. 317. † Quoted in Elliot, p. 7.

which the nicer sensibility of our own day has condemned as vulgar; and in any impartial account of the British attitude this purely material motive has undoubtedly to be taken into consideration. Montesquieu, in the *Esprit des lois*, enlarged on it with characteristic acumen, though with more than a touch of malice, as was natural in the citizen of a country which was then our chief rival. But he was not blind to the great part played by the *nation commerçante* in the polity of Europe, nor to the respectable qualities of its statesmanship. For him, too, the trading instinct of the English makes them 'sovereignly 'jealous of the prosperity of others'; the *nation commerçante* is almost, but not quite, Napoleon's *nation de boutiquiers*; but there is no hint of the legend of *la perfide Albion*. On the contrary, after pointing out the great influence exercised by England on the affairs of her neighbours—which he attributes to her being at once unassailable, and threatening no European State with conquest—Montesquieu says that, whenever she is the centre of negotiations in Europe, she brings to them 'a little 'more honesty and good faith than do the others.'*

The moral authority of Great Britain in the councils of Europe was founded on the general conviction that in certain vital respects her interests and those of the continental peoples were identical. England might be safe behind her 'moat'; but she would remain so only so long as no Power should arise strong enough to dominate the Continent and its coasts, and so be in a position to dispute her mastery of the seas. She was thus forced into the position of protector of the balance of power, which was universally recognised as the conservative basis of the European States system. This position, though the motive for its adoption was, of course, 'security,' carried with it certain moral consequences of the first importance; it made Great Britain the champion of the rights of the weaker States, and also, what was even more far reaching, the champion of the sanctity of the treaties by which these rights were secured. That her policy was sometimes selfish, sometimes foolish, too often entangled—under the leadership of such intriguers as Newcastle—with the petty interests of kings whose hearts were in Hanover, may be true enough. But the fact remains that in that age of diplo-

* *Esprit des lois*, l. xix., c. xxvii.

matic chicane and mendacity which was the eighteenth century, she was—to quote Montesquieu once more—'respected abroad.' She was respected because she pursued a consistent policy, which was European as well as English, and because her power enabled her to pursue it successfully. 'England,' wrote the Swiss jurist, Emerich de Vattel, 'has the honour to hold in her 'hands the balance of power, and she is careful to keep it in 'equilibrium.'*

The pursuit of this policy sometimes involved war, but it was not a warlike policy. It is untrue to say that England, even in the eighteenth century, deliberately provoked quarrels between the Continental States in order to obtain freedom for her colonial expansion. This expansion was sometimes the result of such quarrels, in which England became involved in the interests of the balance of power; but even the elder Pitt, who during the Seven Years' War was 'to conquer America in Germany,' declared in 1747, as a fundamental article of his political creed, that what England needed was a lasting peace. Peace, based on a good understanding with France, had been the aim of Walpole's policy at the beginning of the century; it was also the aim of the younger Pitt at the end. If it was his destiny to pilot his country through the greatest storm she had ever had to weather, this was none of his seeking. It was not until the men of the Revolution threw down a challenge to Europe and, under the mask of a militant political creed, revived the imperialist policy of Louis XIV., that Great Britain, under Pitt's leadership, took up arms once more in defence not only of her own vital interests, but also of those of the whole community of European nations.

During the Revolutionary and Napoleonic wars, of course, as during the great war just ended, the legend of British 'selfish-'ness' and 'perfidy' was a useful weapon in the hands of our enemies; and Napoleon who, like William II., recognised in that impassable moat the fatal barrier to the realisation of his dream of world dominion, stirred up in all Europe a clamour for the 'freedom of the seas.' He found plenty of sycophants, even in subjugated Germany, to re-echo the cry. But it was a German, Friedrich von Gentz, who once more proclaimed the mission of

* *Droit des gens.* Ed. 1758. l. iii., c. iii., I., p. 40.

England as the guarantor of the liberties of Europe. It was British sea power, he said, which stood between Europe and 'the 'most perfect slavery to which the nations were ever subjected'; and he turned with savage invective against those of his countrymen who were busy, in Napoleon's interests, denouncing the British dominion of the seas.

'It is well known with what intimate acquaintance with their subject and with what regard for truth they have entertained, even to satiety, their credulous readers upon the BRITISH COMMERCIAL TYRANNY —upon the OPPRESSION OF THE NEUTRAL NAVIGATION—upon ENGLAND'S MONOPOLY OF THE INDUSTRY AND TRADE—upon the fatal consequences of the EXCLUSIVE POSSESSION OF INDIA, and other calamities of a similar nature. They never minded refutation; to instruct them was impossible. They either did not know, or did not wish to be thought to know, that England in time of peace disturbs no fisher boat at sea, and molests the trade of the Republic of Ragusa as little as that of France; that *in time of war* it acts towards the neutral States in strict conformity to existing treaties—the only standard of national rights; that it justly resents the cancelling of these treaties by violence, and the more so, because the only Power which has an interest in their being cancelled is one which has sworn the destruction of England—that in the view of those streams of wealth which, notwithstanding the restrictions of treaties, flow through the channels of trade into neutral countries, to set up a cry of robbery and oppression is the worst of all absurdities; that France, the uncalled-for vindicator of the *liberty of the seas*, as it is termed, in fact asserts no one's rights.'*

When, mainly as the result of British persistence, Napoleon's power was tottering to its fall, England hastened to make it clear to her Allies that she had no intention of using her immense influence for purely selfish ends. 'The wish of the 'Government,' wrote Castlereagh on the 6th February 1814, from the allied headquarters at Châtillon, 'is to connect their 'interests in peace and war with those of the Continent. Whilst 'the state of Europe afforded little hope of a better order of 'things, Great Britain had no other course left than to 'create an independent position for herself; but now that she 'might look forward to a return to ancient principles, she was 'ready to make the necessary sacrifices on her part to reconstruct 'a balance in Europe.'† These sacrifices were wisely defined at

* 'Fragments on the Balance of Power.' English Edition, 1806, p. xxxiii.

† To Lord Liverpool. F.O.: Continent, France.

a very early stage. There was to be no tampering, in the name of the 'freedom of the seas,' with the established maritime code; but the British Government presented a long list of the conquered colonies which it was prepared to restore to France and Holland. This action produced a profound impression; and it gave Great Britain a reputation which was to stand Castlereagh in good stead at the Congress of Vienna. For at Vienna, owing to the fact that all British claims had already been satisfactorily settled, he was able to play the part of a disinterested mediator between violently conflicting interests, and so to be the main agent in evolving, out of a situation which at one time threatened a renewal of war, the peace settlement of 1815. This was certainly not an ideal settlement, and nobody supposed it to be so. But it was more effective than the Peace Treaty recently signed at Versailles has been, or unfortunately promises to be, since it did restore peace at once to a distracted and war-weary world, and remained the foundation of peace for nigh on fifty years. It did so because its basis was an effective balance of power.

To maintain this balance of power and the treaties on which it was based, continued for many years to be the guiding principle of British Continental policy; and the most effective way of furthering this policy seemed to British statesmen to be to preserve the Alliance, which, originally concluded between the Four Powers and directed specifically against France, was given a wider scope by the terms of the sixth article of the Treaty of 20th November 1815, and was converted, in 1818, into an Alliance of all five Continental Great Powers by the admission of France under this article. The position of Great Britain in this Alliance was, from the first, no easy one. Liberal opinion at home was loud in denunciation of a league which, under the pretence of preserving peace, seemed bent on restoring and preserving every abuse of the old order; and though, during the seven years which elapsed between the Congress of Vienna and that of Verona, the Tory Government continued faithfully to support the Alliance as essential to the maintenance of peace, it soon became clear that there was a fundamental difference of principle between Great Britain and the Continental Allies.

From the British point of view, the scope and functions of the Alliance were strictly limited to the engagements defined

in the treaties, and from the first, British statesmen protested against the attempts of the autocratic Powers, who were terrified by sporadic symptoms of revolutionary unrest, to exalt the Alliance into a supernational authority, armed with vague and undefined powers for the maintenance of order and of the *status quo*. For them the Grand Alliance was one thing; the Universal Union, which that dubious idealist, Alexander I. of Russia, laboured to establish on the basis of the Act of the Holy Alliance, quite another.* Castlereagh at once realised the danger to national liberties involved in the establishment of such a league to enforce peace everywhere and at any time; for, sooner or later, it would claim the right to intervene at its own discretion in the internal affairs of nations, if these affairs were judged to be likely to have a dangerous external effect. When the claim was actually formulated by the three autocratic Powers in the famous preliminary protocol of Troppau, in 1820, Castlereagh at once made a vigorous protest. 'It is proposed,' he said, 'to create a confederacy for the exercise of a right 'which, though undoubtedly appertaining upon the principle 'of self-defence, in extreme cases, to each particular State, has 'never as yet, as a general measure, been made the subject of 'a diplomatic regulation or conjoint exercise.' Great Britain, he concluded, objected to the whole principle involved, and could not consent to charge herself, as a member of the Alliance, with the moral responsibility of administering a general European police of this description.†

Thus the principle of non-intervention was proclaimed as a cardinal doctrine of British foreign policy; that is to say, the right of nations to manage their own affairs so long as they do not offend against the law of vicinage by making themselves an intolerable nuisance to their neighbours. It was the assertion of this principle that led to the first open breach of Great Britain with the Continental Alliance; for when, at the Congress of Verona in 1822, it was proposed to give royalist France a European mandate to suppress the Liberal system in Spain,

* For an account of the experiment in international Government made after 1815, and Great Britain's attitude towards it, see the present writer's 'Confederation of Europe,' of which the second edition has appeared this month.

† F.O.: Continent Circular Dispatches, 1821, No. 32.

Great Britain protested and, when her protests were unheeded, withdrew her representative from the conferences. This action was duly stigmatised as a breach of faith due to our insular selfishness. In reality it was—as Castlereagh had predicted would be the case—the Alliance which had moved away from Great Britain, who had not departed from her consistent policy.

Castlereagh's tragic death occurred on the eve of the Congress of Verona, but his successor, George Canning, took up the threads of policy where he had dropped them. His general standpoint was the same as that of Pitt and Castlereagh. 'Our 'business,' he wrote immediately after the crisis at Verona, 'is to preserve the peace of the world and the independence 'of the several nations which compose it.' Elsewhere he summarised the principles of British foreign policy as 'respect 'for the faith of treaties; respect for the independence of 'nations; respect for the established line of policy known as the 'balance of power; and last, but not least, respect for the honour 'and interests of this country.' Respect for the faith of treaties involved support of the existing Alliance in so far as its relations were defined by treaty, and neither Canning nor his successors contemplated any formal breach with it. If the tie which bound the Great Powers together was ultimately broken, this was due, not to any deliberate decision of Great Britain to pursue a selfish policy, but to the emergence in Europe of a new revolutionary force, which had been neglected in the treaties and was destined in the end to tear them into shreds. This force was the principle of nationality.

It has been usual to take the year 1830 as marking a new departure in British Continental policy. The date is only approximately correct. It is true that in this year the July Revolution in Paris profoundly affected the relations of the Continental Powers; but the Alliance remained for the time being intact, since the three autocratic Powers, preoccupied with the rising in Poland, had no choice but to recognise Louis Philippe on his agreeing to respect the limitations of the treaties. It is true also that in this year Palmerston became Foreign Secretary, and Palmerston was to become known as at once the champion of national aspirations everywhere and the type of British insular combativeness. But these characteristics were only developed by circumstances, and at the outset

Palmerston simply carried on the 'great tradition' of his predecessors. This is evident in his attitude towards the complicated questions raised by the successful revolt, in 1830, of the Belgians against the union with Holland imposed upon them in 1815. The situation was within an ace of developing into a general European war; and, if peace was preserved, this was due to the masterly diplomacy of Palmerston, who for two years succeeded in keeping the Powers more or less in line, so that the agreement under which the terms of separation between Belgium and Holland were ultimately settled was the collective act of Europe. It represented, that is to say, a constitutional amendment, and not a breach of the treaties.

The principles, European as well as British, which guided Palmerston during this crisis are well illustrated in the instructions, dated 1st December 1830, given by him to Lord Ponsonby on his setting out on a special mission to Brussels.* Ponsonby is instructed to regard himself, not as representing Great Britain, but 'as the organ of the Conferences of Ministers 'assembled in London, and representing the Powers who are 'animated by a mutual desire to effect an arrangement which 'should restore peace to Holland and the Netherlands, and 'security to Europe'; and he is to display towards M. Bresson, the French Minister charged with a similar mission, 'unreserved 'confidence and perfect cordiality.' There is no sign here of any intention to break with the Alliance. Indeed, the whole interminable correspondence on the Belgian question, preserved in the Record Office, contains ample proof that Palmerston was most anxious to keep the Alliance together, to safeguard the treaties, and to preserve the balance of power. But he realised that new forces were at work which called for new adjustments, and he refused to allow the results of months of negotiation to be wrecked on a point of legitimist pedantry. In short, when the obstinacy of King William of the Netherlands refused to yield to the friendly pressure of the Powers, he decided that the will of Europe must be enforced; and when the autocratic Powers, after long hesitations, refused to aid in coercing a legitimate monarch into accepting the results of a revolution, he decided to act with France alone. The division of Europe

* Draft in F.O.: 10, vol. ii.

into two groups really dates from the spring of 1832, when a British squadron and a French army co-operated in forcing the Dutch to evacuate the citadel of Antwerp, and to retire behind the frontiers assigned to Holland by the Powers.

For the autocratic Powers this action gave fresh proof of the perfidiousness and untrustworthiness of Great Britain, and in September 1833, the meeting at Münchengrätz advertised their resolve to draw together in support of the sacred principles of the Holy Alliance. Palmerston correctly read the situation. In 1836 he wrote :—

'The division of Europe into two camps is the result of events beyond our control, and is the consequence of the French revolution of July. The three Powers fancy their interests lie in a direction opposite to that in which we and France conceive ours to be placed. The separation is not one of words, but of things. . . . The three and the two think differently, and, therefore, they act differently. . . . When Ancillon (the Prussian Minister) and Metternich complain of the division of Europe into two camps, that which they really complain of is not the existence of two camps, but the *equality* of the two camps. The plain English of it is, that they want to have England on their side against France, that they may dictate to France as they did in 1814 and 1815; and they are provoked beyond measure at the steady protection France has derived from us. But it is that protection which has preserved the peace of Europe. Without it there would long ago have been a general war.' *

Among French historians there is a persistent tradition that Palmerston hated France. So far was this from being the case that he consistently proclaimed a good understanding with France as the keystone of his policy. This policy was not an easy one to maintain. British statesmen—Palmerston, Wellington, Malmesbury, Aberdeen—still believed in the treaties as the sheet-anchor of European peace; and, since the territorial settlements effected under these treaties had been largely at the cost of France, it could hardly be expected that Louis Philippe, still less Napoleon III., should see eye to eye with them in this matter. Yet, in spite of differences which once and again brought the two countries to the verge of war, the force of circumstances, and a common point of view as to the broader principles of policy, always drew them together again, until their

* To Melbourne. 'Lord Melbourne's Papers.' Edited by L. C. Sanders, pp. 337-340. Egerton, p. 183.

good understanding seemed to be cemented for ever by the comradeship-in-arms of the Crimean War. If the *entente* was in the end dissolved, this was due to Napoleon's persistent efforts to secure a revision of the treaties in favour of France, his scarcely disguised ambition to recover the Rhine frontier, and his restless ambition generally, which seemed to British statesmen the chief menace to the peace of Europe.

With the revolutionary years, 1848 and 1849, which saw the rise of Louis Napoleon to power, the relations of Great Britain and the Continent entered on a new phase. These years heralded the break-up of the old order in Europe, and marked the beginning of that universal clash of national ideals which, during the next twenty years, was to lead to the creation of the German Empire and of United Italy, and in our own day culminated in the Great War. In England, public opinion was from the first stirred in favour of 'oppressed nationalities' struggling to be free, and Palmerston shared this sentiment. But he did not allow this to blind him to the greater issue involved in the maintenance of the balance of power and the essential structure of the treaties. For him, as it had been for Castlereagh, the peace of Europe was still the main consideration. He might indulge his sympathy with the Italians by an active diplomacy in their favour; but in doing so his aim was to be 'not the murderer but the surgeon of Austria,' since, in his opinion, the amputation of the Italian Provinces would strengthen her for her proper life-work as the guardian of the West against the over-grown might of Russia. In favour of the independence of Hungary he steadily refused to intervene, in spite of the clamour of public opinion in England; for the independence of Hungary would have crippled the Habsburg Monarchy in its most vital organ. As to this his language was explicit from the very first, and 'if the Hungarians were deceived, 'this was not due to anything which had reached them through 'the English Foreign Office.'*

This attitude illustrates an aspect of British Continental policy which has perhaps led to the greatest misconceptions of its motives and its aims. As champion of the balance of power,

* See Charles Sproxton, 'Palmerston and the Hungarian Revolution' (1919), p. 38. An admirable study, based on the unpublished Foreign Office records.

Great Britain had necessarily been also the champion of the weaker nations against the ambitions of the strong. But, in the first instance, this championship had been confined to 'nations,' *i.e.*, States, whose status of sovereign independence was recognised and defined by treaties—the only sense in which the word 'nation' was then understood. Popular opinion in a liberty-loving country of course went further than this. It tended increasingly to champion also the cause of nationalities which desired to become nations; and British statesmen, partly from conviction, partly under pressure of popular sentiment, became more and more the spokesmen of this view. Their attempts to combine it with the traditional policy, based on the sanctity of the treaties, not unnaturally laid them open to a suspicion of double-dealing and to the charge of hypocrisy; and their very anxiety to maintain the peace of Europe, which led them time and again to confine their intervention to protests which were not followed up by acts, gave fresh force to the belief that England, by encouraging revolutionary movements abroad, was merely pursuing her supposed traditional policy of stirring up strife on the Continent in order to have a free field for her own commercial expansion.

The legend was belied by the whole attitude of England at the opening of the second half of the nineteenth century. She had become the champion of Free Trade; that is to say, of that unfettered intercourse between nations, which is the only possible basis of a stable international system; and the year 1851 saw the opening, in Hyde Park, of the first International Exhibition, intended as a vast advertisement of the economic interdependence of all the world, and hailed as inaugurating the reign of perpetual peace. If this fair dream was so speedily dissipated, the misfortune was not due to any deliberate policy on the part of the British Government. It was due, rather, after the retirement of Palmerston from the Foreign Office in December 1851, to the absence of any clearly defined policy, to the weakness and vacillation of Aberdeen's Government, which was in part the outcome of his very love of peace. There would have been no Crimean War if Great Britain had made it clear from the first that she would resist in arms any attack by Russia on the Ottoman Empire. As it was, her very peaceableness, emphasised by the pacifist propaganda of Cobden and Bright, completely

deceived the Tsar Nicholas as to the temper of the British people. The fault of the British attitude was not that it was perfidious, but that it was weak.

In 1854 this weakness was partly due to the consciousness that Great Britain was hardly in a position to support brave words by effective action. The Army and Navy had been suffered to decline to such a point, that in 1851 Wellington declared that the country was not in a position to resist foreign invasion. The Crimean War certainly did nothing to restore confidence in British military efficiency, and the Indian Mutiny, which followed hard upon it, still further exhausted Great Britain's available strength. The nation, absorbed in using the opportunities for acquiring wealth which the policy of Free Trade had opened up, had little stomach for fresh warlike adventures; and under the influence of the new Liberalism questions of reform at home tended to thrust continental affairs into the background. Not that the British people were wholly indifferent to them. They sympathised with Garibaldi, as they had sympathised with Kossuth. Lord Morley, commenting on Garibaldi's reception in London in 1864, remarks that 'in those days there 'were idealists; democracy was conscious of common interests 'and common brotherhood; a Liberal Europe was then a force and not a dream.'* So far as Great Britain was concerned, however, it must be confessed that the force of Liberalism in foreign affairs mainly evaporated in words.

Sometimes words helped, as in the case of the famous pronouncement in which, in 1860, Lord John Russell proclaimed the sympathy of England with the cause of Italian unity and independence; and this cause was again helped by the refusal of Great Britain to join her naval forces with those of France in order to prevent Garibaldi and his Thousand crossing the Straits of Messina. In this case a sympathetically negative attitude was enough. But it was otherwise when British Liberal idealism found itself face to face with a militarism conscious of its aims. Russell's protest, in the name of the treaties, against the treatment meted out to Poland by the Emperor Nicholas after the insurrection of 1863, profited the Poles nothing, and only earned for Great Britain a humiliating snub, since there

* 'Life of Gladstone,' ii. 109.

was no sign of its being followed by action. The same is true of the equally futile protest, in 1864, against the seizure of the Danish duchies by the German Powers. The protests were ignored; the Danes had merely been encouraged in a useless resistance; and Bismarck, who—as Palmerston at least well realised—had the Kiel Canal already in view, was able, after the overthrow of Austria in 1866, to annex the duchies to Prussia, and thus to lay firm the foundations of the future German sea power.

Disraeli was right when he said in the House of Commons that, as the result of Russell's abortive intervention in the Schleswig-Holstein question, the just influence of England in the councils of Europe had been lowered. This influence he defined as 'the influence that results from the conviction of 'foreign Powers that our resources are great, and that our policy 'is moderate and steadfast.' The position of England in Europe, he said, was 'essentially that of a moderating and mediatory 'Power,' and this position she had certainly maintained during the years that succeeded the great settlement of 1815. But its maintenance depended on the belief of foreign Powers in her willingness and her ability to back her principles by deeds, and this belief had been shaken by the futile demonstrations of 1863 and 1864. Bismarck took the measure of British Liberalism very accurately, and shaped his diplomacy accordingly. Napoleon's restless efforts to secure 'compensations' in Luxemburg and the Netherlands for the aggrandisement of Prussia, played into his hands; and when, in 1870, the attack on France was launched, all he had to do in order to drive Great Britain into an angry neutrality, was to publish the celebrated draft treaty, drawn up by the French ambassador Benedetti, under the terms of which Belgium was in certain contingencies to be annexed to France. Great Britain now indeed intervened, but only in order to safeguard the neutrality of Belgium. For the rest, France was left to meet her fate alone.

From the time of the crushing defeat of France and the consolidation of the German Empire in 1871, until the new *entente* with France in 1904, Great Britain can hardly be said to have had a continental policy. The treaties had been torn to pieces; the balance of power had ceased to be. 'At the present 'time,' wrote Mr. Henry Reeve in 1875, 'the military power of 'the German Empire far surpasses that of any other State, and

'could only be resisted by a combination of all the rest.'* Four years later it was still further reinforced by the Alliance with Austria, which in 1882 became the Triple Alliance by the adhesion of Italy. Great Britain accepted the situation, and turned her attention to further adventures in Africa and in the Far East. The grandiose imagination of Disraeli had, indeed, long before conceived the idea of calling in new worlds to redress the balance of the old. In 1866 he spoke of Great Britain as having outgrown the European continent, as 'really more of an 'Asiatic than a European Power'; and though it may be true, as Professor Egerton says, that in 1874 he struck a somewhat different note, the last effective intervention of England in the great affairs of the Continent in the nineteenth century, carried out under his auspices, was determined not by the interests of Europe so much as by concern for the interests of Great Britain as an Asiatic Power.

With the Congress of Berlin, in 1878, the chapter of European history, which opened in 1815, may be said to close. In the scramble for world power, which began in the eighties, Europe itself seemed to have been forgotten, and the diplomatic storm-centres were no longer on the Rhine or the Danube, but in Egypt, in Tunis, in Nigeria, or in Manchuria. In England the principle of non-intervention in the affairs of Europe was elevated almost to the rank of an article of faith, and it was only in the ever-troublesome Eastern Question that British diplomacy continued to play a more or less effective part. As for the principle of the balance of power, this had passed with the treaties into limbo; and even if British statesmen had continued to accept it as a political axiom, it would have been impossible to create in Europe an effective counterpoise to the Alliance of the Central Powers. Bismarck had seen to that. In order to isolate France and distract her attention from Alsace-Lorraine, he had encouraged her rivalry with England in Africa; in order to divert the threatening attention of Russia from Germany, he had directed her ambitions to the Far East where she came into dangerous touch with Great Britain on the borders of India. So long as England and Russia were at odds

* Article, 'Balance of Power,' in the 'Encyclopædia Britannica.' Ninth Edition. 1875.

in Asia and in Africa, and France and England were engaged in the embittered rivalry which culminated in 1898 in the Fashoda incident, there was no prospect of restoring the balance in Europe.

It was not till the opening years of the present century that the growing self-assertiveness of Germany, backed by the steady increase of her armaments, awoke Great Britain to the fact that her position in the world was being challenged, and to the possibility that her Empire might once more have to be defended upon the battlefields of Europe. It is not necessary to tell again how the sense of common peril drew France and Russia together, and how, when her differences with these two Powers had been happily adjusted, Great Britain entered into relations with them, which made it clear that the Triple Alliance was faced by a Triple Entente, and that England once more held in her hands the balance of power. All that need be said here is, that it was not the conscious resumption of a broken tradition, but what Palmerston called 'the force of occurrences' which had driven Great Britain back in the direction of a policy which alone gave promise of security to herself and to Europe against the horrible calamity of war. How was it, then, that peace was not preserved?

We may dismiss at once, as utterly without foundation, that legend of the 'encirclement' of Germany which was propagated by the Prussian militarists in order to throw dust in the eyes of the German people, and thus to enable them to embark on a war of aggression under the guise of a war of defence. Yet, though we know that the accusation that England desired and brought on the war is false, it is well to make clear to ourselves in what respects British statesmanship in this great crisis of the world's history fell short; to realise why Great Britain, who desired peace, did not succeed in maintaining it. The reason, it appears to me, was that while Great Britain in 1914 held in her hands the balance of power, she was not 'careful to 'keep it in equilibrium.' The *entente* with France and Russia was clear enough; its terms and its implications were wholly obscure. Herr Kautzky's revelations show that the Kaiser egged on Austria to attack Serbia in the conviction that England would, in any event, maintain an inglorious neutrality. Hence his rage when, after he had committed himself to the support of Austria, Sir Edward Grey's statement to Prince Lichnowsky showed him that in certain events England would

intervene. If, from the very first, it had been made quite clear that England would stand beside her Allies in the event of their being attacked by Germany, the balance of power would have been complete and obvious, and Germany would never have risked a war. It was, as Lord Loreburn has recently made plain,* the uncertainty of Great Britain's attitude that made war possible.

For this uncertainty individual statesmen were less to blame than the conditions under which British foreign policy has to be pursued. 'Statesmen,' says Mr. Egerton, 'especially under a 'democratic system, must perforce work for the immediate 'present, and live from hand to mouth.' The revelations of Lord Morley's 'Recollections' and of Sir Charles Dilke's diaries have shown how true this is of the British Cabinet; how the gravest decisions have been influenced by the necessity, or the supposed necessity, of humouring a wholly uninformed public opinion; and how in foreign affairs the interests of party are apt to outweigh the interests of country. Lord Loreburn blames Sir Edward Grey for having kept not only Parliament, but the Cabinet, in the dark as to his policy. But it is more than probable that, in spite of the obvious menace from Germany, any proposal to convert the *entente* into a definite defensive Alliance would have met with strenuous opposition from a large section of the nation, which, if it had heard of the balance of power at all, had heard of it only as a discredited shibboleth. It needed the German violation of Belgium to open the eyes of the British democracy; and then it was too late to save the world from the agony of the most terrible of all wars.

But no one can read Sir Edward Grey's dispatches during the crisis of July 1914 without realising that Great Britain earnestly desired peace, or fail to recognise the transparent honesty of his language and his intentions. In this respect he was but following the true tradition of our Foreign Office, which may be summed up, in the words of Canning, already quoted, as 'respect for the faith of treaties; respect for the independence of 'nations; respect for the established line of policy known as the 'balance of power; and, last but not least, respect for the honour 'and interests of this country.' The legend of 'perfidious Albion' is a legend, and nothing more. W. ALISON PHILLIPS.

* Earl Loreburn, 'How the War Came.'

PARLIAMENT AND FINANCE

1. **Reports from the Select Committee on National Expenditure.** 95 and 121. 1918.
2. **Parliamentary Grants.** By Col. A. J. V. DURELL, C.I.S. Portsmouth: Gieves Publishing Co. London: John Hogg. 1917.

TO assert that the Parliament Act has imposed upon the House of Commons an enhanced responsibility verges upon a commonplace. But even a truism may be true. Down to the year 1911 the British Constitution was not only in name but in fact bi-cameral; the House of Lords was a co-ordinate branch of the legislature, and the right of the Peers 'to 'withhold their assent from any Bill whatever to which their 'assent was desired' was, as Lord Farnborough (Sir Thomas Erskine May) emphatically said, 'unquestionable.' From the judgment of Erskine May on a point of this kind there can be no appeal. By long established usage the Upper House had indeed abandoned the right either to initiate or to amend Bills dealing with public expenditure or revenue. Under resolutions passed in 1671 and 1678 the House of Commons had claimed the sole right of initiation, and had denied to the Lords the power of amendment; but the right of the House of Lords to *concur* in Money Bills was never denied by any competent jurist, and the right of rejection was successfully asserted in 1909.

The challenge flung down by the Lords, by the rejection of Mr. Lloyd George's Budget, was accepted by the Commons, and an appeal ensued from the legal to the political sovereign. The verdict given by the electorate in January 1910 was by no means so unambiguous as the opponents of the House of Lords would have desired. A second appeal, at the close of the same year, evoked a response even less satisfactory. Nevertheless, in the session of 1911 the sword, so long suspended over the heads of the Peers, descended upon them, and the Parliament Bill passed into law. By Clause I. it was enacted that—

'If a Money Bill, having been passed by the House of Commons, and sent up to the House of Lords at least one month before the end of the session, is not passed by the House of Lords without amendment within one month after it is so sent up to that House, the Bill shall,

unless the House of Commons direct to the contrary, be presented to His Majesty, and become an Act of Parliament on the Royal assent being signified, notwithstanding that the House of Lords have not consented to the Bill.'

Thus the House of Commons became, for the first time, indisputably omnipotent in the sphere of finance. It is unnecessary to labour the point that the responsibility thus arrogated to itself by the House of Commons has been enormously increased by the events of the last five years. The Budget of the future will have to provide for a revenue not less than four times as large as the revenue of 1911, and the House of Commons will have to supervise the expenditure of the enormous sum thus extracted from the pockets of the taxpayer.

Is the House of Commons competent for the task it has assumed? Is the existing machinery adequate for the purpose? Does the form in which the annual estimates are presented to the House assist or hamper it in the performance of this responsible function? Are the rules of procedure so framed as to enable the House of Commons to exercise that control over expenditure which of all its multifarious duties is at present the most insistent? It is the purpose of the pages that follow to attempt an answer to these questions.

During the session of 1918 a Select Committee on National Expenditure, after prolonged investigations conducted under the chairmanship of Mr. Herbert Samuel—an exceptionally able and experienced administrator—presented to the House of Commons ten Reports, of which two are in the present connexion especially important. The first of these (Seventh Report of 1918) dealt with the form of public accounts; the second (Ninth Report of 1918) with the procedure of the House. Both these Reports, containing as they do much authoritative evidence, and many valuable suggestions, are worthy of attentive study. The subject-matter is however highly technical; it is not easily intelligible to those who are unfamiliar with the present procedure of the House of Commons, and not even to them without some effort. Small wonder therefore that the Reports should have attracted less attention than they deserve.

We may examine first the Report on the form of public accounts. Technical though the subject may be, there is not a business man in the country who would not acknowledge and

even insist that a sound method of book-keeping is a primary essential of commercial success. Scientific accountancy is at last coming to its own. 'Costings' are a vital element in modern business procedure, and the Public Departments can no more afford to neglect the precautions which this method of accountancy provides than can any commercial firm. Nor can the House of Commons—and this is the point of immediate importance—begin to enforce economy unless and until the accounts are presented to it in such a form that members can at a glance detect where the wastage, if wastage there be, is taking place.

The question under discussion is far from being one of mere 'black letter' or antiquarian interest; but it may not be out of place to interject at this point a few words on the history of the matter. The principle of 'appropriation' was successfully asserted by the House of Commons as far back as the reign of Charles II., but it was not until after the Revolution of 1688 that a beginning was made towards devising machinery whereby the principle could be enforced. The produce of specific taxes was then assigned to meet specific charges. This was a clumsy and uneconomical device, and in 1787 the younger Pitt established the Consolidated Fund. Into this vast financial reservoir flows 'every stream of the public revenue,' and from it issues 'the supply for every public service.' (13th Report of Commissioners of Public Accounts, p. 60.) The pivot upon which the whole working of the financial machinery now depends is the Controller and Auditor-General, a non-political functionary whose office dates from the Exchequer and Audit Departments Act of 1866. Meanwhile important steps towards parliamentary control over national expenditure were taken by the establishment and gradual meticulation of the Civil List. In this way a distinction was drawn between the revenue of the Crown and the revenue of the nation, to the obvious advantage of both. In regard to the national revenue two points plainly deserve attention: the raising of it, and the spending of it; but only with the latter are we at present concerned. The House of Commons maintains, or attempts to maintain, its control over expenditure (1) by voting the annual Estimates; and (2) by receiving the annual Accounts. Neither Estimates nor Accounts are, however, presented in a

sufficiently explanatory form. The Select Committee reported in 1918 that Estimates and Accounts, prepared on the present basis, are of little value for purposes of control either by Departments, the Treasury, or Parliament, and this conclusion was supported by the highest expert opinion. 'I do not think,' said Mr. Dannreuther, Accounting Officer of the Ministry of Munitions, 'that Estimates as furnished in the past to 'Parliament are worth the paper they are written on from the 'point of view of parliamentary control.' Sir Charles Harris, Assistant Financial Secretary to the War Office, was not less emphatic, and was more precise. 'You cannot,' he said, 'get 'any real control of expenditure by cash issues or cash pay- 'ments, excluding such factors as liabilities, consumption of 'stores from stock, and things of that sort. You cannot control 'administration by controlling expenses on subjects. If you 'want to control administration by appropriation you must 'appropriate to objects.' The evidence given to the Select Committee by the Controller and Auditor-General (Sir H. J. Gibson) confirmed that of Sir Charles Harris. 'If,' he said, 'you wish to establish financial control it can be better 'effected by the objective rather than the subjective scheme. 'I have always felt that the subjective classification, though 'very simple and convenient, did not lend itself to establishing 'a unit of cost by which you could control and compare the 'cost of one service with another.'

Testimony so emphatic in tone, so concurrent in effect, and above all so authoritative in source, must be regarded as virtually conclusive ; but Sir John Bradbury, at that time Joint Permanent Secretary to the Treasury, supplied in his Memorandum a pertinent reminder. 'In criticising,' he wrote, 'the existing 'scheme of appropriation of Parliamentary Grants, it must be 'borne in mind that the control of expenditure, in the sense of 'securing that the various public services are efficiently ad- 'ministered at a reasonable cost, was no part of the object which 'the framers had in view.' Precisely. All that the House of Commons sought to secure was an effective audit: to make certain that the money voted by Parliament for a particular service had been spent upon that service and upon no other. That function is admirably performed by the Committee on Public Accounts, with the expert assistance of the Controller and

Auditor-General, an officer whose complete independence alike of the Executive and of the Legislature is secured by the fact that his salary is charged upon the Consolidated Fund, and that he is not permitted to sit in Parliament. All the revenue collected by the fiscal officials is paid into the Exchequer account at the Bank of England and the Bank of Ireland. From that account not one penny can be withdrawn without the sanction of the Controller and Auditor-General, whose duty it is to present annually to Parliament an audited account, together with a report, in which it is shown that the sums appropriated by the House of Commons to the several services have been expended strictly upon them and not otherwise. This system goes far to secure purity and regularity of administration, and as a system of audit the present procedure could hardly be improved.

Is this enough? So long as the Public Departments were few and the expenditure modest; so long as the functions of Government did not go much beyond the securing of the safety of the realm against external enemies and the maintenance of order at home, an effective audit was all that was required. But times have changed. New ministries, with colossal staffs, spring up like mushrooms. The Ministry of Labour, for example, is to-day spending more than was ever spent upon the Navy in pre-war days, and much of the expenditure of other new departments is of a commercial rather than an administrative character. If the House of Commons is, as guardian of the public purse, to exercise any efficient control over national expenditure, new methods of accountancy more nearly in accord with the best commercial practice are essential. In a Memorandum, prepared for the Select Committee by Sir Gilbert Garnsey and Mr. J. H. Guy, it was stated that—

'In ordinary commercial practice the accounts are considered as of vital importance to the business as an index of economical administration and sound management, and a very great deal of attention is given to the system of accounts in use, and to the periodical statements submitted to the directors and to those in charge of various departments of the business, affected by the results shown. It is doubtful whether there is any instrument of administration which receives greater consideration in a well organised business.'

It may be urged that departments of State ought not to undertake commercial functions, and that commercial methods

are therefore inappropriate to the public service. To the first half of this plea the present writer would cordially assent; but the fact, however regrettable, remains that the State appears to be increasingly anxious to undertake duties which had far better be left to private enterprise and private management, and that being so Parliament, as the Directorial Board responsible to the shareholders, must adopt methods appropriate to the discharge of its new duties.

The House of Commons has not yet done so. 'The 'Committee find that *no vote or account includes the total cost of 'the service to which it relates.*' I venture to italicise words which seem to go to the root of much of the existing confusion.

Appended to the Navy and Army Estimates, and to each vote of the Civil Service and Revenue Departments Estimates, are notes showing that 'provision is made as follows in other 'Estimates for expenditure in connection with this service.' For instance, in the votes for the Foreign Office and the Colonial Office (1918), while the sums estimated are £65,547 and £58,626 respectively, the notes above referred to show that for the Foreign Office a further £40,982, and for the Colonial Office a further £20,925 are provided under other votes for expenses of buildings, furniture, fuel and light, rates, stationery and printing, pensions, postal, telegraph and telephone services, etc. Again, in the relatively small vote for the Registrar-General's Office (Scotland), no less than 70 per cent. of what professes to be the vote for the expenses of that office is provided for and accounted for in other votes.

Does this system conduce either to departmental economy or to intelligent criticism and supervision on the part of the House of Commons? We must admit that the existing practice does not lack official apologists. It is urged in defence of it that Parliament already possesses in the notes to the Estimates and in the statements appended to the Reports of the Controller and Auditor-General all the information it needs; that inter-departmental payments are objectionable in themselves and involve greater expense; and that by the separation of financial from administrative responsibility, control would be loosened. No one will deny that these arguments have considerable force, but, on the whole, the rejoinder contained in the Report of the Select Committee seems to be conclusive. Firstly: the 'notes'

to the accounts are purely statistical and in no sense audited accounts; they are not compared with the 'notes' in the Estimates, and they are not made by the departments on whose behalf the expenditure is incurred.

'If' (says the Report) 'the obligation were placed on departments to take up in their estimates and accounts their total expenditure as a matter of accurate accounting, an audit based on this obligation would follow, and no account could be certified as correct, which excluded from its expenditure any stores supplied or services rendered for the period it covered. Except in the few cases where departments compile manufacturing or commercial accounts, no department can render an account of its expenditure, because no department fully knows it. Its buildings, stationery, rates, pensions, postal, telegraph and telephone expenses, are all finally recorded as matters of account in the accounts of the departments administering these services.'

Secondly: the objection to inter-departmental payments, valid though it may have been some years ago, ceases to apply now that receipts arising out of the working of departments are to so large an extent appropriated in aid of the votes. In passing it may be observed that the whole system of appropriations-in-aid is essentially a vicious one, and tends to encourage carelessness and to obscure extravagance. As long, however, as it prevails it vitiates the argument against inter-departmental payments. Finally: why should control be loosened if, apart from the normal control exercised by the Treasury, the supplying departments continue to obtain repayment of the cost of the services they render from the departments which are supplied?

At present control is, or ought to be, applied at four points: (1) by the head of the Spending Department; (2) by the Financial Secretary or Accounting Officer; (3) by the Treasury; (4) by Parliament. The best expert opinion would seem, at the moment, to tend towards the conclusion that this control can be most effectually applied *within the department*, and by a departmental rather than by a Treasury official. On this point the evidence given to the Committee by Mr. Bonar Law, Mr. Chamberlain, and Mr. McKenna, was concurrent and emphatic. 'The actual control,' said the last, 'must always lie with the 'departments, and all that Parliament can do is to inquire 'whether the departments have done their work properly.' 'The real control,' wrote the present Chancellor of the Exchequer, 'is exercised first within each department by its

, secondly by the Treasury, and lastly, in case of ence of opinion, by the Cabinet.' Of the efficiency as a check upon expenditure, Mr. Chamberlain pressed himself as highly sceptical.

thing needful is however a revised form of public a form as will 'bring to light extravagance and and enable criticism to be usefully applied.' With taining this object, the Select Committee made c and detailed recommendations. *Inter alia*, they that the estimated expenditure of the year, as Estimates, and the actual expenditure as dis- Accounts, should be on a basis of income and epresenting the cost of services rendered, and of upplied for the service of the year; that the all departments should comprise their *total* including the services rendered by other Public the rental value of Government-owned buildings sions paid, and pension liability; that the Estimates s should be grouped to show the objects, rather jects of expenditure, and with carefully chosen ; that as far as possible there should be one e series of accounts only for each service of the the accounts presented to Parliament should be the Parliamentary Estimates of true annual and that they should be prepared in such a manner in all their stages a control, by means of units of n effective use should be made by comparison of under like conditions both inside the department d with other departments of the State.

ommendations, contained in a Report submitted to Commons on 31st July 1918, have as yet been to a very limited extent. Thanks no doubt to nfluence of Sir Charles Harris, the Army Estimates nodelled. In addition, the Select Committee were rstand that the Admiralty would be prepared, by 9, with a form based on the same principles as d by the War Office, but no such form has been (it is believed) prepared; and so recently as 29th ne House of Commons was informed by the the Exchequer that it would not be practicable to

adopt the new form in preparing estimates generally for 1920-21. In particular there appear to be special reasons connected with the recasting of Admiralty store accounting arrangements which make the adoption of the new form impossible at the Admiralty for the coming year.

Thus the practical results so far attained by the prolonged and arduous labours of the Select Committee are disappointingly slight; but the whole question has been exhaustively explored; the House of Commons has, for the first time perhaps, been made aware of the dangers to national economy lurking behind the existing forms of Estimates and Accounts, and if it prefers to stand in this matter in the ancient ways—ways not inappropriate when accounts were relatively simple and expenditure was relatively small—the blame will rest upon itself.

We turn from a more or less technical subject to a cognate but distinct aspect of the same problem. As long as the system of accountancy remains imperfect, economy if effected at all can only be a happy accident. Under the existing rules of procedure the control exercised by the House of Commons must inevitably be superficial and perfunctory. Before proceeding to discuss various devices suggested for the improvement of the machinery, it may be desirable to explain, with brevity, what the present financial procedure is. The Estimates, having been framed by the department, having been passed by the Treasury and approved by the Cabinet, are submitted to the House before the close of the financial year (31st March). For the purpose of considering these Estimates the House resolves itself into Committee of Supply. Resolutions of Supply, after being carried in Committee, have to be reported to the House and embodied in a Consolidated Fund Bill authorising payment out of the Consolidated Fund. For reasons of financial convenience Consolidated Fund Bills are passed at intervals during the session, but at the close of the session they are all embodied in one Appropriation Act, which appropriates the previously authorised expenditure exclusively to the particular objects approved by the resolutions passed in Committee of Supply. This system, as the Report (121 of 1918) reminds us—

'was established in the days of recurring conflict between Parliament and the Crown as a device to secure freedom of discussion on

matters of finance. The debates in the House itself were recorded in the *Journal*, which was sometimes sent for and examined by the King; and they were conducted in the presence of the Speaker who in those days was often the nominee and regarded as the representative of, the sovereign. By going into Committee under the chairmanship of a member freely selected, the House of Commons secured a greater degree of privacy and independence.'

But the so-called Committee of Supply possesses none of the attributes of an effective Committee. The rules of debate are, it is true, somewhat more elastic than those which govern procedure in the House itself, but a 'Committee' of 700 members is a contradiction in terms, and even if the time at its disposal were not (as it is) severely restricted, the detailed examination of financial estimates would be impossible. Moreover the 'Committee' can neither call for papers nor examine witnesses; it lacks therefore both time and information. Effective criticism of financial details being out of the question, 'Committee of Supply' has come to be utilised for a totally different purpose: the exposure of grievances and criticism of the policy of the Executive. For these purposes Committee of Supply affords an admirable opportunity, and to these purposes it is mainly devoted. As a result, 'questions of finance are 'crowded out.'

There is another formidable obstacle to the efficiency of the existing procedure. If a vote is challenged, or a reduction moved, such a motion is treated as one of confidence, involving the fate of the Government. Independent action, if not independent criticism, is thereby rendered impossible, and criticism if not followed by action is, as every one knows, apt to degenerate into triviality, and to issue in futility. Under these circumstances, as the Report points out—

'It is not surprising that there has not been a single instance in the last twenty-five years when the House of Commons by its own direct action has reduced, on financial grounds, any estimate submitted to it. . . . The debates in Committee of Supply are indispensable for the discussion of policy and administration. But so far as the direct effective control of proposals for expenditure is concerned, it would be true to say that if the estimates were never presented, and the Committee of Supply never set up, there would be no noticeable difference.'

Can anything be done by a reform of procedure to make the control of the House of Commons a reality? To the con-

sideration of this vital question the Select Committee applied itself with diligence, and in order to give the greater weight to its conclusions framed a *questionnaire* which was sent to the Speaker, the present and three ex-Chancellors of the Exchequer, to several Members expert in procedure, and to various officials of the Government and the House. With few exceptions all the high authorities who were consulted concurred in the view which was subsequently endorsed by the Select Committee that 'the existing procedure of the House of Commons is 'inadequate to secure proper parliamentary control over the 'national expenditure.' Some distinguished respondents however not only replied, but retorted, being inclined to question the will of the House towards economy, not less than its power to enforce it. 'The House,' wrote Mr. Speaker, 'has become 'one of the chief spending departments of the State.' Mr. Asquith, Mr. Hayes Fisher (now Lord Downham), Sir Donald Maclean, Sir Charles Hobhouse, and Sir Courtenay Ilbert, all insisted that the House of Commons, instead of criticising details of expenditure on the ground of excess, is now chiefly concerned in advocating increases of expenditure. That there is (or was) much substance in this imputation cannot be denied. But the imputation, however well justified and effective as a retort, in no sense invalidates the conclusion at which the Select Committee arrived. Even though the House be predisposed to extravagance, it nevertheless remains true that it lacks the power to enforce economy.

Then as to suggested methods of reform. The great majority of the replies to the *questionnaire* favoured the principle that the Estimates should be subjected to examination by a Select Committee, and the Select Committee itself unanimously endorsed this suggestion. It was accordingly proposed that at the beginning of each session there should be appointed, by the customary procedure, two Standing Committees on Estimates, each consisting of fifteen members, and that a third should be added if experience showed that this was desirable. It would be the duty of these Committees to consider the annual Estimates, and such Supplementary Estimates as the conditions allowed, and to suggest to the House any economies, which might be both possible and desirable, while strictly excluding any questions of 'policy.' Policy, as the Committee insisted, is a

matter for the Government and the House, but not for such Committees on Estimates as are here contemplated. To permit the discussion of policy would be 'to invite controversy within 'the Committees,' to endanger the success of the experiment, and above all to impinge upon the responsibility of the Executive. Some of the respondents were clearly apprehensive on this latter point, and Mr. Austen Chamberlain in particular definitely disapproved of the suggestion, on the ground that it would diminish the responsibility both of the Treasury and of the Government. The Estimates Committee were further to be assisted by a permanent Officer of the House, whose functions in relation to Estimates would be parallel with those of the Comptroller and Auditor-General in relation to the Accounts. Such technical assistance seems to be an essential element in the scheme. For lack of it, the Estimates Committees, which were set up in 1912, 1913, and 1914, found themselves greatly hampered in their work, and were in fact able to achieve little.

During the discussions in the Expenditure Committee, the question was raised whether it might not be possible to amalgamate the Estimates Committees and the Public Accounts Committee. A few respondents favoured the suggestion, but after consideration the Committee decided, and it seems wisely, against amalgamation. The functions of the two bodies are in reality entirely distinct, and although it might, and probably would be desirable, that some members should be common to both Committees, it is plainly preferable that each body should have its own officer, and that their functions should be in practice, as they would be in theory, distinct.

One point in this connexion remains to be emphasised. The decisions and recommendations of the Estimates Committees would not have any binding effects; their functions would be limited to inquiry and report; the House of Commons would remain solely responsible in all matters of finance. Of that ultimate responsibility no Committee should or could relieve it. Nor of course is it to be expected that the Committees would review all the estimates every year. The Committees would be set up at the earliest practicable date after the beginning of each session, and at an early stage of their proceedings would indicate to the Chairman of Ways and Means the classes or votes, if

any, on which they did not propose to report during the current session. The remaining Estimates would be considered in the order most likely to meet the convenience of the House, and a Report would be made as soon as the consideration of the Estimate for any given department was completed. The business to be taken on successive supply days would then be regulated accordingly. Those votes would be taken first on which the Committee had already reported, or had intimated their intention not to report during the particular session. It would still of course remain open to the House to vary this procedure, and to take any vote on which there happened to be a strong desire to debate some matter of grave public importance. As regards the discussion of grievances, the House would therefore be as untrammelled as it is to-day, but in the examination of financial details there would be an order and regularity of procedure which are at present conspicuous by their absence.

So much for the Estimates Committees. That they would prove valuable adjuncts to the financial procedure of the House is hardly open to question; but it is the considered opinion of many of those best qualified to judge that they would fail of their full effectiveness unless a further change of fundamental importance in the conventions of the House of Commons were simultaneously adopted. To the detached observer of the working of English institutions it has always seemed a trifle ridiculous that the fate of Governments should depend upon the result of a decision on some minor economy in a departmental estimate. To regard every such vote as a question of 'confidence,' to interpret an adverse division as a censure upon the Government, is surely to strain the theory of a Parliamentary Executive to the breaking point. So long as existing convention is held sacrosanct, so long as private Members are unable to enforce in the division lobby their views on a question of departmental economy, without risking the fall of the Government which they habitually support, thus plunging the country into the turmoil of a general election, it is obvious that the smaller issue must be eclipsed by the larger, and that a decision on the merits of the question must be impossible. On this point the opinion of the Select Committee was emphatic, and must surely command general assent:—

'Only when the House of Commons' (so the Report runs) 'is free, not merely in theory and under the terms of the Constitution, but in fact and in custom, to vote, when the occasion requires, upon the strict merits of proposed economies uncomplicated by any wider issue, will its control over the national expenditure become a reality.'

The Committee accordingly recommended that :—

'It should be established as the practice of Parliament, that Members should vote freely upon motions for reductions made in pursuance of recommendations of the Estimates Committees, and that the carrying of such a motion against the Government of the day should not be taken to imply that it no longer possessed the confidence of the House.'

This recommendation was endorsed by Sir Charles Harris, while Sir Charles Hobhouse expressed the view that it was one of the most important in the whole Report. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker treated the suggestion much more lightly. He expressed doubts whether 'His Majesty's Government have ever 'considered a reduction made in an estimate as a matter of 'confidence unless they sought the opportunity themselves for 'resigning,' and further held that even if the suggested change were in itself desirable, it could not be embodied in a Standing Order. Issuing from a source so authoritative, such an opinion is sufficiently disquieting, but even more so perhaps is the view characteristically expressed by the present Chancellor of the Exchequer that nothing but the fact that Ministers do regard reductions as questions of confidence prevents the House from doubling the Estimates under the guise of motions for reduction.

A more technical point, but one hardly less important, is raised in the recommendations of the Select Committee in regard to 'Money Resolutions for Bills.' There is perhaps no part of the procedure of the House which calls for more careful revision. Important as is a close scrutiny of the Estimates, no student of recent legislation will deny that scrutiny at least equally close ought to be made into the financial side of ordinary Bills. Take any of the larger items in the programme of legislative 'reconstruction'—the Housing Act, the Transport Act, or the Electricity Supply Bill. In all these problems the crucial factor is finance. On that rock the Housing Act has already foundered. But how much consideration does the House of Commons necessarily give, under the existing system

of procedure, to this vital aspect of social legislation? Standing Order 71 runs as follows:—

'If any motion be made in the House for any aid, grant, or charge upon the public revenue, whether payable out of the Consolidated Fund, or out of money to be provided by Parliament, or for any charge upon the people, the consideration and debate thereof shall not be presently entered upon, but shall be adjourned to such further day as the House shall think fit to appoint, and then it shall be referred to a Committee of the whole House, before any resolution or vote of the House do pass thereon.'

The Order is, in terms, sufficiently impressive, and would seem to secure due consideration for any motion involving a charge upon public funds, and the rules of procedure implement the Order. If the main object of a Bill is to impose a charge upon the people, its introduction must be preceded and authorised by a resolution of a Committee of the whole House, which resolution must be recommended by the Crown. Such resolutions are not likely to escape notice, nor to pass without full consideration. Far more insidious is the procedure in relation to Bills, of which the creation of a charge upon public funds is, in form, only a subsidiary feature. Such a Bill may be introduced in the ordinary way, and it is sufficient if the requisite resolution is agreed to by the House before the clause to which it relates is reached by the Committee on the Bill. Clauses requiring such resolutions are printed in italics, and are not supposed to form part of the Bill as introduced. It may sometimes be a moot point whether the charge upon public funds is the main object of a Bill or merely a subsidiary feature of it. The point was in fact recently raised in connexion with the Imports and Exports Regulation ('Anti-Dumping') Bill. The Speaker was asked to rule the Bill out of order on the ground that, being a Bill to impose taxes, it ought to have originated in Committee of Ways and Means. He declined however to do so because, in his view, 'the main purpose of the Bill was to exclude 'dumped goods and goods competing with key industries, and 'the imposition of charges in the nature of Import Duties' was merely incidental to the adoption of such a policy. Nevertheless, since the Bill would impose fines upon importation, resolutions would be required in Committee of Ways and Means before the financial clauses could be taken in Committee of the House. The point is a subtle one, and difference of opinion

may legitimately exist as to the accuracy of the ruling. Be that as it may the incident pertinently illustrates the existing rules of procedure.

A more substantial question remains: Does the existing procedure afford adequate safeguards against extravagant and ill-considered expenditure? No one who is acquainted with the conduct of business in the House of Commons can answer this question in the affirmative. Money resolutions on Bills of the widest scope, and calculated to involve huge expenditure, are taken after eleven o'clock, or at other odd moments after the close of the main business of the sitting; they pass often without explanation, and commonly without discussion. Unless private Members happen to be unusually alert they may be passed quite unnoticed, and the country may wake up any morning to find itself committed to large expenditure, while the guardians of the public purse were absent or asleep.

Thanks to the recommendations made by the Select Committee on National Expenditure, some small improvement has in this matter been already effected. Among the questions submitted to the authorities mentioned above were these—whether it was advisable to retain the existing practice in regard to (1) Money Resolutions for Bills containing Financial Provisions; (2) the Report Stage of such Resolutions already passed in Committee; and (3) if so, whether a definite estimate of the expenditure likely to be involved should be required, in each case, to be presented to the House. The questions elicited very various replies. Mr. Asquith and Mr. Austen Chamberlain appeared to regard the procedure as 'antiquated,' and therefore inadvisable; Mr. McKenna and Mr. Arthur Henderson favoured abolition; while the Speaker and the Clerk of the House 'concurred in the view that the existing 'procedure does act as a substantial check upon expenditure.' Sir Courtenay Ilbert indeed went further, and insisted that the procedure is essential for the purpose of maintaining ministerial responsibility and initiative in matters of finance. As to the advisability of strengthening the existing procedure, and requiring 'a definite estimate of the expenditure involved,' there was even greater hesitation. Sir Charles Hobhouse and others advocated a statutory limit of expenditure but the Speaker, Mr. Austen Chamberlain, and Mr. Hayes Fisher (Lord

Downham) were opposed to a definite estimate, mainly, it would seem, upon the ground that, if such an estimate were made obligatory, the department concerned would be inclined to put in a high figure, and would then feel entitled to spend it. Several respondents however favoured the suggestion that the money resolutions should be accompanied by a more or less reasoned forecast of expenditure, provided by the department or Minister, for the information of the House.

In the event the Select Committee, after full consideration of the advice tendered to them, recommended that the existing procedure with respect to money resolutions for Bills involving expenditure should be not merely retained, but substantially strengthened and extended. In particular, they expressed a decided opinion that the terms of the money resolution should invariably be placed upon the Notice Paper of the House; that in the case of Bills not originating in Committee this should be done before second reading; that wherever possible the Resolution should comprise a statement of the probable expenditure, whether annual or capital, or alternatively should be accompanied by a White Paper, furnishing such a statement. There are, and must be, cases in which precise forecasts are impossible, but the Committee recommended that in such cases a White Paper should nevertheless be issued giving a full explanation of the reasons why no forecast could be furnished. They further recommended that the statements of probable expenditure should be submitted to one of the proposed Estimates Committees for examination and report, unless on account of urgency, or of the smallness of the sum involved, the House should by resolution dispense with this procedure in a particular case. It would then become the duty of the Estimates Committee to elucidate the facts, and to examine the basis of any estimate that may have been furnished, or the reasons for not furnishing it. It must however be understood that the purpose in view would not be the insertion of a definite figure in a Bill in every case. That would often be impracticable, and sometimes, as the Committee justly add, 'injurious to good administration.' The real object of these precautions would be 'to insure that Parliament should not pass legislation involving 'financial commitments without a clear idea based on the 'inquiries of one of its own Committees, of the nature and extent

'of those commitments,' so far, of course, as they can be foreseen or ascertained.

Estimates Committees not having been set up, the scheme adumbrated by the Select Committee could not, in its entirety, be adopted. Yet the suggestions have not been altogether without effect. On the contrary the procedure in regard to money resolutions was, thanks to the vigilance of a few private Members, more of a reality during the past session than it had been for many years past. White Papers have, in accordance with the recommendations of the Select Committee, been furnished to the House; debates, brief as a rule, but not quite perfunctory, have been initiated; legitimate delays have been interposed, when the information vouchsafed by Ministers appeared to be inadequate, and in one or two important cases—notably in regard to the Transport Bill—strict limitations of expenditure have been imposed. Wiseacres and cynics may be disposed to say that the present House is young, and that economy is, in theory, momentarily fashionable. That may be; yet the fact remains that Ministers have shown increasing deference to the obvious wishes and anxieties of the House in a matter of transcendent importance to the common weal.

Other points of considerable significance are touched upon in the Reports to which reference has throughout this article been made. Of these some are too technical for treatment in these pages, but two at least are of wider import and deserve some brief notice.

Both ultimately raise the question as to the position of the Treasury in the administrative hierarchy. The Treasury is in many respects, alike on historical and practical grounds, the most important department of the central Government. It exercises or ought to exercise a strict control over the expenditure of all other departments. Not a penny of the sums apportioned by Parliament to the several services can legally be spent without a warrant signed by two Lords of the Treasury; and, since it is the Treasury which has ultimately to find the money, all estimates must as we have seen be approved by the Treasury before they are submitted to the House of Commons by the Minister more immediately concerned. Two tendencies have however manifested themselves in recent years. On the one hand the Treasury, once the vigilant

watch-dog of the State, has itself become a great spending department; on the other hand, the principle of Cabinet solidarity or collective ministerial responsibility has sensibly weakened, with results highly detrimental to the Treasury.

On the former point Mr. Austen Chamberlain (not then at the Treasury) expressed himself, in answer to the *questionnaire*, with great emphasis and explicitness:—

'Such Bills' (he wrote) 'as the Old Age Pensions Bill, or the Insurance Bill, should never be in the charge of the Chancellor of the Exchequer during their passage through the House, nor I think should their administration after they have passed into law. The effect of placing them in the hands of the Chancellor of the Exchequer is to turn the Treasury into a spending department. All control is abolished. There is no entrenchment behind which the Minister can take shelter, as is the case when a Bill is in charge of another Minister, who must obtain the Chancellor's consent before he makes any considerable financial concession.'

The Select Committee so far concurred in Mr. Chamberlain's opinion as to recommend that the Treasury 'should cease itself 'to be a spending department.'

As regards the relation between a Chancellor of the Exchequer and his ministerial colleagues, the Committee showed less acquiescence. The question raises a large issue; nothing less indeed than that of Cabinet solidarity. During the later years of the war all the time-honoured principles of Cabinet Government were necessarily jettisoned. Administration was frankly departmental, as it has always been in the United States. With a return to peace conditions the inconveniences attending the presidential system became so glaring that the old Cabinet system has been nominally restored. How far the restoration will arrest the previously observable tendency towards departmental detachment remains to be seen, but in relation to financial control the Select Committee expressed themselves without ambiguity.

'We consider that the Ministry as a whole should be responsible both for making and for declining to make proposals to Parliament for increased expenditure. There have been departures in recent years from the practice by which an individual Minister was not considered at liberty to dissociate himself publicly from his colleagues, and while himself retaining office, to throw upon the Treasury the onus of refusing a particular grant affecting his own department. We deprecate these departures which, if they became the rule, would make the position of a Chancellor of the Exchequer almost untenable. We recommend that the former practice should be rigidly observed.'

Most people competent to judge will probably assent to the propositions here laid down, and will agree that it is almost hopeless to look for any effective Cabinet control over public expenditure if the departments are permitted to work in splendid isolation. In this respect the older departments, with their established traditions, set a very good example to the younger and less disciplined offices. The Department, the Treasury, the Cabinet, the House of Commons—this is the circle of financial responsibility. Control can be rendered effective only on two conditions: first, if each individual link in the chain is sound; secondly, if the chain itself is unbroken.

The preceding pages may seem to labour many topics that are trite, and to discuss in tiresome detail many questions of merely technical significance. Can anything be regarded as merely technical which concerns the financial methods and procedure of the representative assembly which is responsible for the raising and the spending of a revenue whose volume would have amazed our fathers, and appalled ourselves, could we have foreseen it but five short years ago? Half a century before the outbreak of the Great War, expenditure stood, thanks to Mr. Gladstone's jealous vigilance, at £65,914,856—almost the precise figure at which it had stood half a century earlier, at the time of the Great Peace of 1815. When Mr. Gladstone left office in 1886 it stood at £94,000,000, and the veteran financier was aghast at the prospect that expenditure might reach £100,000,000. It just passed that figure in 1896-97. In the current year expenditure is not likely to fall much short of £1,800,000,000.

Under these circumstances no excuse is needed for inviting all citizens of intelligence and goodwill to scrutinise somewhat closely the methods by which the House of Commons seeks, or does not seek, to control national expenditure. These methods are admittedly obsolete and insufficient, nor are they likely to be rendered much more effective unless, and until, the average Member of Parliament can be induced, by constantly exerted pressure from the average elector, to apply his mind to the solution of a problem which is undeniably difficult and not superficially attractive. Yet on the wise and prompt solution of that problem depends beyond question the stability of the State.

J. A. R. Marriott.

NATIONALISATION

1. **Reports and Minutes of Evidence of the Coal Commission.** Cmd. 359 and 360. 1919.
2. **Memorandum on Coal Mining Conditions in Germany.** By DAVID EVANS. Cardiff. 1919.
3. **The Guild State.** By G. R. STERLING TAYLOR. George Allen & Unwin. 1919.

THE present demand for the nationalisation of many of our most important industries is a political paradox. Government interference with industry and commerce during the war, and in the months succeeding the armistice, has created an ever-growing volume of public irritation. Reversing the old Latin tag, it may be said that the Government has touched nothing that it has not disfigured. And yet after this accumulated experience of the handiwork of the State, we find powerful organisations engaged in trying to force Parliament to transfer to the ownership and control of the State industries of such immense importance as the coal industry and the railway industry, while minor organisations are busily but less noisily advocating the nationalisation of land, both urban and rural. There is even an occasionally expressed demand for the nationalisation of shipping and banking.

The main explanation of the paradox is that war time experience of State control has created a widespread belief that under nationalisation the manual worker will get higher wages than under private enterprise. This belief has given a new political value to the whole movement for nationalisation. Before the war the advocates of State socialism, though extremely energetic, were comparatively few in numbers. Their arguments were necessarily of a theoretical character, and the mass of mankind feels little interest in theories. The average workman is much more concerned about the amount of his wages than about the principles of Karl Marx. He is also concerned to secure shorter hours of working, not so much for his own sake as out of loyalty to his fellows. The demand for shorter hours is usually a collective demand put forward in

the belief that the shortening of the hours of work necessarily reduces the danger of unemployment. But both the individual desire for a better wage and the collective demand for shorter hours conflict, sooner or later, with the interest of the private employer. Doubtless many private employers might, in their own interest, wisely have paid higher wages to some workpeople than they were doing before the war; and equally in their own interest they might wisely have reduced in some cases the hours of working. But a point must come when a further increase of wages, or a further reduction of hours, will irreconcilably conflict with the employer's interest by entirely wiping out his profit.

Before this point is reached the private employer is compelled to oppose further concessions, not only for his own sake, but for the sake of the industry itself; for if all chance of profit disappears, the capital necessary to continue the industry will no longer be forthcoming. In the pre-war period these considerations were appreciated by large numbers of workpeople, especially in well organised industries, such as the cotton industry. The Lancashire cotton operatives have for a long time past fully understood that the continuance of their employment depended on the possibility of producing cotton goods at a price low enough to command a market in India and China, and other overseas countries. They also have long understood that capital for building new mills, or for re-equipping old ones, would not be forthcoming unless the capital already employed could show a fair profit. Their demands for better wages and shorter hours were therefore limited by these conditions. In many other industries, though perhaps in none so clearly as the cotton trade, these fundamental limitations were appreciated, and workpeople realised that if they pressed their demands too far the source of their employment would disappear altogether.

The war has revealed the existence of entirely new possibilities —or apparent possibilities. Where men have been employed by the State, they have discovered that there is apparently no limit to the demands which they can successfully make. During the war they had only to ask in order to get. Not only had they the immense advantage of having the law of supply and demand in their favour, as a result of the military demand for

man power, but in addition they were able to bring to bear upon the State, which was directly or indirectly their employer, a tremendous political leverage by threatening to strike. In some industries, such as the coal industry, a prolonged strike at critical periods of the war might have rendered our armies almost impotent, and involved the defeat of ourselves and our allies. Whether the men would have carried their threats to such a point it is difficult to say, but ministers, in face of the possibility of such an overwhelming disaster, made concessions to avert the peril. It is significant that some of the miners' leaders have openly boasted that they secured, on several occasions, increases of wages by threatening to strike during the war.

Since the armistice a new factor has appeared, or rather an old factor has reasserted itself. Politicians are dependent upon votes, and weekly wage-earners possess a very large proportion of the total voting power of the nation. Therefore it is worth the politician's while, in his own interest, to win the approval of the wage-earning class, even if by so doing he injures the nation. He may not even know that he is injuring the nation. There is no obligation upon a member of Parliament or even upon a premier to study the problems of national economy. It is sufficient for success in political life to be able to estimate what course will produce most votes; the rest can be left to chance. An increase of wages granted to any group of work-people is generally popular with wage-earners as a body; for the fact that wages are primarily paid by an employer creates the impression that any wage increase means a gain to the wage-earning class at the expense of the employing class. Consequently, ministers of the Crown, shrewdly estimating their own political interests, have repeatedly during the past twelve months as well as during the war, made lavish concessions to the work-people employed in industries that have come under State control. It is not surprising that the rank and file of the wage-earning classes should draw the inference that State employment necessarily means better pay and shorter hours. From the wage-earner's point of view, the alleged advantages of nationalisation appear to have been conclusively demonstrated, with the result that the theories of a handful of Socialists now receive enthusiastic support from millions of potential voters and potential strikers.

Thus, on the one hand, we have widespread irritation at the wastefulness, obstructiveness, and inefficiency of State management; on the other hand, we have a powerful political and industrial movement in favour of the wholesale nationalisation of industry. The issue presented to the country is graver than any with which it has been confronted since the critical days of hesitation that preceded 4th August 1914. The danger is, that the issue may be decided by the counting of heads before the heads to be counted have had time to consider the arguments.

At the outset let it be admitted that, up to a certain point, there is full justification for the popular belief that the State can afford to pay any wages that are asked. Provided the State is only responsible for one or two industries of very moderate dimensions, it can continue indefinitely to pay almost any wages to the work-people employed in those industries; for it can obtain the necessary revenue by taxing all the other industries of the nation. At the present time the State is responsible for the financial results in at least three very important industries—the Post Office, the railways, and the coal mines. In all of these the State, or an organisation acting under the orders of the State, has a monopoly, and can charge what it chooses for the goods and services supplied. Those charges have to be met out of the wealth produced by private industry, so that even if the charges made covered cost, it would be accurate to say that the State, through its monopoly, is in a position to debit private enterprise with the cost of the high wages paid to the employees in these State-controlled industries. As a matter of fact, the charges do not cover cost; the Post Office and the railways are worked at a loss, and a great deal of coal is sold for less than cost price. The deficiency is made good by grants from the public exchequer. Some of the losses on household coal sold below cost may be made good out of the profits on coal exported, but in the main the money required for exchequer grants can only be found either by taxing private enterprise or by borrowing from private capitalists—using the word 'capitalist' in its correct sense as meaning any person, rich or poor, who invests money or has money available for investment. In the current financial year public revenue will not cover our aggregate public

expenditure, so that it may fairly be said that three great industries are now partly maintained by the State out of additions to the national debt.

Sooner or later that method of financing industries of such magnitude as these must come to an end. And the end will be reached all the sooner the further State enterprise, on similar lines, is extended; for each additional State controlled industry, with its high scale of State guaranteed wages, will mean an additional burden on the public exchequer, with a simultaneous reduction in the number of profit-yielding private enterprises. To put the matter in a sentence—as fast as State enterprise is extended, the possibilities of obtaining revenue by taxing private enterprise are diminished. Consequently, when all the industries of the nation have passed under State control, the State will have no source of revenue except its own industrial operations. It will then only be able to pay wages out of the actual product obtained, minus whatever sums may be required for the cost of administration, for the renewal of plant, and for the extension of business. In other words, the State, as universal employer, will be subject to exactly the same limitations as those which now determine the wage-paying capacity of private employers. When this fairly elementary proposition is grasped, it will be seen that the high wages paid by the State during the war and since the armistice, furnish no argument in favour of a policy of wholesale nationalisation. On the contrary, unless it can be shown that State management is more efficient than private management, the extension of State enterprise must mean the lowering of wages, even in those industries now under State control. For as soon as the State loses the revenue which it now obtains by taxing private enterprise, and loses also the possibility of borrowing from private capitalists, the general body of work-people will certainly insist that the wages in the industries at present favoured shall be brought down to the general level.

Thus the real question to be decided is whether we can rely upon State enterprise to produce better industrial results than private enterprise. If not, if the product of the State is lower than the product of the private employer, then inevitably the employee of the State will ultimately be in a worse position than he would have been if private enterprise had continued.

State Socialists invariably assume that State enterprise is more economical than private enterprise. Before discussing the theories which underlie this assumption, it is desirable to examine it from the point of view of practical experience. From that point of view the answer is conclusive. Neither in our own country, nor in any other country, is there to be found any instance of a State enterprise competing successfully on even terms with private enterprise. In the vast majority of cases the State begins by establishing a legal monopoly in its own favour, so as to be immune from competition. Even so there are very few instances of the State producing results which are satisfactory, from the financial point of view. In our own country there are none.

For many years it was the habit of State Socialists in this country to claim the Post Office as a brilliant example of a successful State enterprise. They pointed to the handsome profit of four or five millions a year; they emphasised the excellence of the regular collection and distribution of letters; and they might also have noted the fact that postal servants were being paid at a higher rate than men doing work of similar difficulty, or simplicity, in private enterprise. On the surface the case looks magnificent. But what are the facts? In its origin the Royal Mail was, as its name implies, a Royal service. It was instituted for the purpose of conveying letters to or from the Court on affairs of State. As late as 1621 all the posts of the kingdom, which even then were only four in number, started from the Court.* Private individuals were permitted to dispatch letters by the Royal Post; but it was expressly provided in the same reign, that of James I., that 'no pacquets ' or letters,' except such as were on the King's service, should 'binde any poste to ride therewith in post.' Constant attempts were made by private persons to organise the conveyance of private letters; but the Government would not even permit merchants to send letters by their own agents, lest the correspondence should be used for promoting plots. Somewhat later the idea of making the King's post a source of profit to the State began to develop, and in the middle of the seventeenth century a definite scale of charges was authorised, beginning

* See 'The History of the Post Office.' By Herbert Joyce.

with 2d. for any distance under eighty miles. The charge to Scotland was 8d., to Ireland, 9d. These were the charges for 'single letters'; what were called 'double letters' paid double fees. In spite of the small amount of correspondence, these heavy fees were lucrative, and the Crown obtained an appreciable revenue. But the Royal Post only dealt with letters between town and town on specified routes; it had no local organisation for the collection and delivery of letters.

In the year 1680 William Dockwra, a merchant of the city of London, financially assisted by some of his friends, organised a local service for the metropolis, which was in many respects in advance of the postal service in London to-day. On 1st of April he opened between four and five hundred receiving offices, where messengers were to call for letters every hour. In the centre of London there were ten to twelve deliveries a day; in the suburbs, four to eight. The service included parcels up to one pound in weight. The charge throughout the greater part of London was one penny, which covered not only the cost of collection and delivery, but also insurance up to a value of £10. The charge had to be prepaid, so that to Dockwra, in the seventeenth century, belongs the credit of introducing the system of payment in advance, which was not generally adopted by the State Post Office till the nineteenth century. Further, he has the credit of introducing the system of post-marks, which he devised in order to provide his customers with a means of testing the efficiency of the service. At the end of twelve months this daring venture began to be self-supporting. But immediately its success became evident, the Duke of York, on whom the profits of the Royal Post Office had been settled, complained that his monopoly was being infringed. Dockwra was cast in damages, and his organisation was annexed by the State.

The penny post which he had established continued in being as a separate organisation under the State for over a century. In 1801, as a war measure, all postal charges were raised, and the London penny post became a twopenny post.

The penny post of modern times was also the outcome of private initiative. It was forced upon the Post Office by an agitation led by Rowland Hill, who, approaching the problem from a non-official point of view, saw clearly that when a large

number of letters are carried, the cost of conveyance per letter is insignificant, and that consequently a uniform rate, regardless of distance, was then a feasible proposition. He pressed this point on the public, with the result that uniform penny postage for letters was authorised by Parliament in 1839, in defiance of the bitter opposition of the Postmaster-General. That opposition was based on the calculation that the immediate result of lowering postal rates would be a reduction in the net profits of the Post Office. The calculation was justified by the first few years' experience, but the loss was quickly made good by the expansion of business, as Rowland Hill with sound business instinct had foreseen. The advantage to the country of this reform, forced upon the Post Office from outside, was immense, and the example set has been copied by all other countries. But it is significant to note that the peculiarly good local service for parcels as well as letters which Dockwra had instituted in London has disappeared.

Thus there is nothing in the earlier history of the Post Office to justify the praise which has been lavished upon it by Socialists as an example of State enterprise. Nor is there any display of special ability in its modern performances. It has to be remembered that the present efficiency of the postal service is largely dependent upon the existence of roads and railways throughout the kingdom. Both are the creation of private enterprise. That our railways were built by private capitalists everybody knows; but a good many people, who have grown up in an era of public highway authorities, do not realise that the highways, which are now kept in order at public expense, were most of them originally built by private capitalists, who recouped themselves for their expenditure by charging tolls to the persons who used the roads. The Post Office pays nothing at all for the use of these roads, and only a moderate fee for the use of the railways. Its main operations consist in sorting the letters at the different offices, carting them to and from the railway, and distributing them from house to house.

In evidence given before the Committee on Public Retrenchment in the autumn of 1915, the Secretary to the Post Office stated that the department calculated that the total cost incurred by it per letter was just under a halfpenny, and on this account he justified the continuance of halfpenny postcards

and halfpenny circulars. The bulk of the business consisted of penny letters. Thus the alleged triumph of the Post Office resolves itself into this: that a government department possessing an absolute monopoly was, till recently, able to make a large profit by charging a penny for hundreds of millions of services, each costing, on the average, rather less than a halfpenny. The work, it must be added, is of the simplest possible character. A letter carrier needs mainly to be able to walk and to read; a letter sorter to stand and to read. No elaborate financial arrangements are needed for running the business, for the service is paid for before it is performed. Under such conditions a child could hardly fail to make a profit.

The other services performed by the Post Office are slightly more complex, and in every one of these State enterprise has proved a failure. The telegraph service has been in the hands of the State for now just fifty years, and in every year except the first two there has been a loss. The aggregate loss is well over £30,000,000. When the proposal to purchase the telegraphs was first made, the advocates of the scheme refrained from asking for any monopoly for the State; but when the scheme was embodied in a Bill, a clause was slipped in, conferring upon the Postmaster-General an absolute monopoly of communication by means of electricity. The result was that as soon as the telephone was invented, the Post Office for several years used all its power to stifle the new invention. This is the main reason why the telephone was more slowly developed in the United Kingdom than in the United States, and also in comparatively poor countries like Sweden and Norway. The progress of the telephone, in spite of official obstruction, finally decided the Post Office to buy out its competitors. By the common consent of all telephone users the result has been an inferior service. Nor have the financial results been satisfactory. For a few years receipts covered costs, but the service is now being run at a loss. The minor services worked by the Post Office—parcel post and money order service—are not protected by a monopoly, and involve a financial loss to the State.

These facts sufficiently dispose of the favourite Socialist theory that the Post Office is a brilliant example of the success of State enterprise. It is indeed improbable that

Socialists will, in the future, dwell so often as they have done in the past on this alleged triumph of State socialism. For, since the war, the profit on letter carrying, which was the outstanding feature of the pre-war Post Office, has disappeared, in spite of a fifty per cent. increase in the principal charge for letter postage. The result is that the annual estimates of the Post Office now show a heavy deficit. In the current year, according to the estimates published in October last (Cmd. 376), the deficit will be £1,400,000, as compared with a pre-war profit of often over £5,000,000. This tremendous drop is due to the simple fact that the wages of postal servants have been raised without regard to the selling value of their services. The payments made to them, added to the other expenses of the department, exceed the revenue obtainable from the charges which the department makes to the public. Thus the one supposed example of the success of State enterprise has become a commercial failure.

In other directions the Socialist claims are less definite. They vaguely allege that State railways have been a success in the Australian colonies, but these allegations are not supported by responsible colonial witnesses. They also claim that German State railways have been brilliantly successful; but there is no precise evidence to support these claims. The Prussian State railways apparently showed a favourable balance-sheet before the war, but no conclusions can be drawn from this fact without fuller statements than have yet been published in this country. Three important facts have to be borne in mind: first, that Prussian railways traverse country that for hundreds of miles is almost entirely level; secondly, that they used to command a great deal of the through traffic between different foreign countries; thirdly, that the Prussian bureaucracy was less subject to political influences than the bureaucracies in more democratic countries. For all these reasons it is impossible to draw any general inference from the experience of the Prussian State railways.

Nor, so far as railways are concerned, is there anything to be gained in looking abroad when we have a clear object lesson at home. The English railway system used to be the finest in the world. It was entirely the outcome of private enterprise. It was, moreover, a pioneer service, and as such had to surmount difficulties which railway constructors in other countries were

able to avoid. The only favour it asked from the State was the grant of compulsory powers for the purchase of the necessary land, so that some obstructive individual might not be able to block a whole line of railway. That favour was grudgingly given. The State insisted that each separate project for railway construction must be formulated in a private Parliamentary Bill. These private Bills were submitted to Committees of the House of Commons and of the House of Lords respectively, who heard counsel and witnesses for and against. The cost of this procedure fell upon the promoters, and meant an enormous addition to the capital expenditure for every mile of railway constructed. Moreover, this procedure placed a weapon in the hands of private landowners who wished to blackmail the companies, by making it better worth the while of the promoters of a scheme to pay extravagant prices for land than to deal with additional opposition before a Parliamentary Committee. Yet, in spite of these difficulties, private enterprise in England and Scotland has provided the community with a magnificent railway system. The money was subscribed by thousands of private persons, some of whom, during the railway mania, almost starved themselves in order to be able to buy shares. On much of the money invested not a penny of dividend has ever been paid; but, taking the system as a whole, it did provide, before the war, a moderate return to the investor, while providing for the community an excellent passenger and goods service at a moderate cost. The whole system is now under the complete control of the State. The service is in every respect worse than it was before the war, and the charges made for it are in most cases greater. Yet, instead of covering cost, it shows a heavy deficit.

Another striking answer to the theorising of the State Socialists is furnished by the mining industry of Great Britain. Like the railways, the coal mines of England and Wales and Scotland were developed entirely by private enterprise. An instructive example of what capitalist enterprise means is furnished by the story of the Horden Collieries.* The Horden

* Information with regard to these collieries was supplied to the present writer in April last by the managing director of the Horden Company, and by the Horden Colliery manager. The latter, Mr. Prest, subsequently gave evidence before the Coal Commission.

Company was started in the year 1900, and the sinking of the pits began in the same year. The directors, in appealing to the public to take shares in the Company, frankly said: 'All 'undeveloped mining enterprise must necessarily be somewhat 'of a speculative character.' Several newspapers in their financial columns adversely criticised the scheme, and said in effect that the enterprise was too speculative to justify public support. The directors asked for £400,000; they only received from the public £47,000; all the rest had to be found by themselves and their private friends. Before the coal was reached very serious water difficulties were encountered, and for several weeks continuously sixty-seven tons of water were pumped up every minute of the day and night. Further capital had to be raised before the work of development was complete. Altogether £900,000 was spent over a period of seven years before any dividend was paid. A considerable part of this capital expenditure was for houses for the miners. The whole scheme of development was framed with regard to future possibilities. The mainways, shafts, and machinery are capable of handling and drawing nearly twice the present output, and will do so as soon as the necessary houses for additional men can be built. This example is typical of the way in which many of the most important coalfields of Great Britain have been developed. A comparatively small number of wealthy men have voluntarily risked very large sums of money in the hope of winning more. Their example has been followed, generally at a cautious distance, by large numbers of less wealthy persons. Some investors have made fortunes, others have lost all their money; but as the result of this private investment the nation obtained the coal. Moreover, before the war the coal was cheap, and each class of consumer was able to procure the class of coal that he wanted. During the war the coal industry passed under the control of the State. The results are before our eyes to-day.* Coal costs more than it used to cost; there is less of it to be had; a worse evil still, persons who want coal of a particular

* Speaking at the meeting of the P. and O. Steam Navigation Company, Lord Inchcape, the Chairman of the Company, said: 'Our 'bunker coal in London before the war, when prices were governed by 'free competition, cost us 23s. a ton; under Government control it 'costs no less than 105s. (*Times*, 11th December 1919.)

quality for a particular purpose are supplied with a quality altogether unsuitable. Nor are these inconveniences confined to humble private individuals—mere citizens and taxpayers. The same inconvenience has been experienced by public bodies engaged in industrial operations. Great municipal corporations have complained repeatedly to the Coal Controller's department that they are being supplied with unsuitable coal. If such complaints were laid before a private firm they would command instant attention, for the representatives of the firm would know that failing redress the business would be taken elsewhere. But under State control the aggrieved citizen or municipal corporation is debarred from this remedy. Everyone, including even other departments of the Government, must submit to the dictation of officials who will continue to draw their salaries whatever blunders they may make, and however insolently they may ignore legitimate complaints.

The mining industry in Germany furnishes a similar example of the results of State control. Lengthy reports on the German State mines were published in the course of last year by the Coal Industry Commission. From these reports the following significant statement may be quoted :—

'A comparison of the figures of the development of State-owned mines and those in private ownership, based on the Quarterly Statistical Returns of the German Empire, shows that while the State mines still occupy an important position in the domain of the coal output, in spite of all the efforts of the Prussian Government they have been unable, in the course of years, fully to maintain their former relative importance.'

In the early months of last year the German Government appointed a Socialisation Commission to examine the question of the nationalisation of the coal industry. This Commission issued a majority and a minority report as to plans of organisation ; but the whole Commission unanimously concurred in the introductory paragraphs to the report dealing with general principles. Those paragraphs include the statement that :—

'The proceedings of the Commission have shown, while admitting all the advantages of the State control of mining, such startling examples of the inadequacy of this cumbrous State organism, that there cannot exist a particle of doubt as to the necessity of a radical change. The over-burdening of highly trained officials with petty duties, the

objectless change of posts, the poor salaries, almost ridiculously small as compared with those in private industries, the restrictions on freedom of action, the lack of confidence reposed in those financially responsible, the complicated systems of grades—the protracted discussion of matters which could be settled in a few hours—in a word, control on the top of control, instead of personal responsibility and an incentive to initiative—these are the characteristics of this organisation.' *

Further evidence on the results of State mining in Germany is to be found conveniently and very clearly set forth in a memorandum, prepared by Mr. David Evans, on behalf of the Monmouthshire and South Wales Coal Owners' Association. It is sufficient here to refer to the account given of the negotiations of the Prussian Government Mining Board with the Westphalian Coal Syndicate in 1911. An agreement was reached in 1912, which would have enabled the Prussian Government to get an enhanced income from its colliery investments; but public opinion went against the Government, and the agreement was cancelled. A compromise was, however, reached. This provided for a general increase of about one mark per ton in the price of coal, 'but in order to still 'the voice of public opinion, the Government, while raising the 'price of coal and coke intended for industrial purposes, agreed 'to continue to sell coal and coke for private houses at the old 'prices.'

This striking illustration of the way in which the management of nationalised industries is deflected by political pressure is peculiarly interesting, because it is an exact counterpart of the action taken by our own Government in December last. In order to appease popular clamour, the Cabinet, without any warning, suddenly announced that the price of household coal was to be reduced by ten shillings a ton, leaving coal for industrial purposes still subject to the high price previously fixed. This step necessarily involves very grave practical and economic difficulties. In practice it is impossible to draw any absolute line of demarcation between industrial coal and household coal; so that the new order involves official inquiry into the destination of each hundredweight of coal, so as to prevent industrial users from obtaining the benefit of the arbitrarily lowered price. It involves the further inconvenience

* *Review of the Foreign Press, Economic Supplement*, 26th March 1919.

that many of the mines which produce coal specially fitted for household consumption are obliged to sell at a loss, for the politically-determined price of household coal does not cover cost of production. Consequently, it becomes necessary to set up new official machinery for the payment of a subsidy to these mines, and the money will have to be provided—as above mentioned—either out of the profits made on the sale of coal for export, or by further taxation, or by further addition to the national debt.

Needless to say, there is no economic justification for this political distinction between household coal and industrial coal. It is just as important—and in some ways even more important—that we should have cheap coal for our factories as for our domestic fire-grates. But that is a consideration which only a minority of voters can appreciate, whereas every householder appreciates the advantage of cheaper coal for his own home. Consequently, a Government playing for popular favour takes a decision which cannot be defended from the point of view of national economy or of public finance.

If further examples be needed of the incapacity of the State to handle industrial problems, they can be found in the achievements of the Shipping Controller and of the Food Controller In both these departments blunder has followed blunder, and the blunders have had to be paid for, not by the officials or the politicians who are responsible for them, but by the outside public, by merchants and manufacturers, by professional men and manual workers, all of whom have had to suffer because the State has clumsily interfered with their business, or needlessly taxed them to pay for its mismanagement.

Thus, judged by practical experience, nationalisation has proved a complete economic failure. Is there any theoretical reason for disputing the verdict of this practical experience? By way of answer to this question the Socialists assert that, if society were organised on the new model which they contemplate, the altruistic characteristics of man would have fuller scope, and all men would work for the good of all. To give some kind of solid support to this attractive speculation the Socialists point to the example of the nation at war. Curiously enough this example is quoted even by Socialists who denounce war as an inexcusable crime, and who themselves refused to play

any active part in the war in which their country was engaged. However, let that point pass. The really important point is, that the appeal to the example of war is fallacious, by whomever it is made. It involves the assumption that the operations of war are analogous to the operations of industry; that a battlefield is in fact only a special type of workshop. Thus stated, the inherent absurdity of the comparison becomes fairly obvious. The motives which induce men to fight are fundamentally different from those which induce them to work. Most normal men are ready, when their country is in danger, to fight, and if need be, to die for her sake; very few men are willing, in time of peace, to sacrifice either their wages or their profits for the benefit of the public exchequer.

The reason for this fundamental contrast is that, when a community is at war, all its members understand that individual sacrifice is necessary to avert a common danger. But where there is no overwhelming danger to be averted, the normal man sees no obvious reason why he should sacrifice his pecuniary interests for the benefit of the community as a whole, or for the benefit of other individuals who are as capable of looking after themselves as he is. This contrast of motives, due to contrast of conditions, has existed from all time, and is likely to continue to exist as long as human beings remain human.

When we come to the actual battlefield, the contrast with the conditions prevailing in a workshop is so glaring that it is difficult to understand by what mental process the Socialist persuades himself that it is possible to use the example of war as a basis for industrial organisation. In the battlefield, death momentarily threatens every soldier, and therefore life itself assumes a smaller value. Stern discipline has taught the soldier the duty of instant obedience to orders, however unpleasant, however apparently meaningless. If told to stay in a muddy ditch under continuous shell fire for forty-eight hours, or if need be for ninety-six, he stays, and it does not occur to him to ask for overtime pay, with double rates for night work. On the battlefield, if the spirit of service should fail and the military servant of the State should venture to disobey orders, he may be tried by court-martial and shot the next morning; in the workship, when an industrial servant of the State disobeys

orders, the worst that can happen to him will be dismissal, with a sporting chance that his union may call a strike and demand his reinstatement.

It is of course possible that the Socialists contemplate the introduction of military discipline into State workshops. The Russian Bolsheviks have already done this, and in Russia the employees of the State who go on strike are mercilessly shot. The British Socialists, though they openly proclaim their general sympathy with the Bolsheviks of Russia, have not yet explicitly stated that, when their plans are complete, death will be the penalty for disobedience to orders in a State factory. Failing the introduction of military discipline, the State, as industrial employer, will only be able to rely upon those motives which actuate human beings in the ordinary avocations of peace; and the question we have to ask is whether those motives are likely to lead to greater efficiency under a system of nationalisation than under a system of private enterprise. The answer is in the negative.

The most dominant of human motives is the instinct of self-preservation. So long as industry is organised on the basis of private enterprise, that instinct promotes efficiency; for the private individual knows that if he gives bad service he will lose his business or his employment. No such fear overhangs the Government organiser or the Government servant. If a Government enterprise fails, the loss falls not upon the people who are responsible for the management of the enterprise, but upon the general body of tax-payers. The permanent officials concerned hold their appointments on a life tenure. The worst that can happen to them, in the case of a glaring failure, is transference to another department, with possible increase of pay. The politicians who are behind the officials are equally immune from any unpleasant consequences if, through their mismanagement, the concerns entrusted to their control are involved in loss. A minister of the Crown may involve the public exchequer in a needless expenditure of scores of millions of pounds by granting a bonus of 12½ per cent. to certain classes of State employees, without pausing to consider the consequences; but such wanton waste of the nation's money will not injuriously affect his political career. After a brief interval an even more conspicuous appointment will be found for him and, provided he plays the

political game with astuteness, he can continue to make whatever industrial blunders he likes.

The subordinate officials, on whose industry and intelligence the success of any enterprise must very largely depend, have no greater personal incentives to efficiency than have their official and political chiefs. In a commercial firm, junior employees who seem to promise well are put in charge of minor departments, are given a fairly free hand, and are watched to see if they make good. If they succeed they are promoted, or their salaries are raised; if they fail, they are perhaps given another chance; but continued failure will mean either that they are confined to the lower grades of work, or that they are asked to leave. In a Government department these obvious devices for securing efficiency are ruled out by the conditions of the service; for it is necessary that employment in the Civil Service should be permanent in character in order to prevent political corruption. The Americans for nearly a century refused to accept the plan of a permanent Civil Service, and Government servants were as easily dismissed as the employees of any private firm. Theoretically, that system gave to the rulers of the country the opportunity of weeding out the inefficients and promoting the best men; practically the American system resulted in wholesale political corruption. Every election was liable to be followed by a complete sweep in the Government offices, the nominees of the defeated party being turned out, and the nominees of the victors installed in their places.

To diminish this intolerable evil, the United States has in recent years adopted—at any rate, partially—the English system of a permanent Civil Service. That system has the supreme merit of securing honest servants for the State; but it secures little more. The qualities which make for efficiency in industrial enterprise are not to be found in the Civil Service. A distinguished civil servant, in a private letter recently addressed to the present writer, says:—'No one who has not been actually 'in the service has any idea how enterprise and originality are 'regarded as crimes.' But is the fact surprising? It is a necessary condition of a permanent Civil Service that promotion shall be by seniority, and that men shall not be dismissed except for openly scandalous offences. Otherwise it is certain that political influences would dominate the whole service. The

men who had political friends would be promoted, and excuses would be found for getting rid of those who were politically friendless, in order to provide berths for the *protégés* of the party in power.

Provided the State confines its operations to the essential business of Government—the protection of life and property, and the enforcement of honest dealing between man and man—the lack of enterprise and initiative in the Civil Service is a matter of little consequence, for these qualities are not greatly needed for such work ; honesty is the supreme necessity. But if the State is to launch out into every kind of industrial enterprise, the necessary limitations of the permanent civil servant become fatal to efficiency. This fact has now been realised, even by the most ardent advocates of the system of nationalisation. One after the other they have been denouncing bureaucracy. Speaking at Liverpool on 27th October 1919, Mr. Frank Hodges said :—'Bureaucratic control would be worse than private enterprise.' Mr. William Brace, M.P., expressed a similar opinion in the House of Commons on 28th November, and amplified his statement at the meeting of the Trades Union Congress held on 9th December to demand universal nationalisation. He then said :—

'The mining industry was in a state of chaos and confusion. No development work of any particular character was being undertaken. The sooner the Government made up its mind where it stood the better for the nation. Better far go back to the old system of private ownership and control than continue as they were now. . . . The nationalisation which the miners proposed was not the kind of nationalisation about which their opponents talked. They said, "Look at the telephone system." Well, it was pretty rotten. He knew nothing that had caused more vocal or silent profanity. But the reason was that the telephone was controlled bureaucratically. The miners proposed that the mines should be operated by the people who knew best, by a union of labour with the hand and labour with the mind.' (*Times*, 10th December 1919.)

The preachers of guild socialism, who may be regarded as one of the advanced wings of the Socialist Party, are specially insistent on the dangers of bureaucracy. In an extremely interesting little volume, describing the principles and possibilities of the Guild State, Mr. Stirling Taylor writes :—

'Centralisation has meant in practice the triumph of the governor over the governed. . . . Centralised government, which has collected

so much of the public work into one spot, has thereby succeeded in concealing the culprit from the victim of his inefficient rule. There are tens of thousands of officials in a great government. Who is the one responsible? Behind which of those thousands of windows and doors does he sit? Through how many of these corridors and rooms will a letter wander if one writes to tell him of his sins? And since he is so safely out of reach, will he much worry if your letter does reach him?'

And again :—

'Bureaucracy, as a matter of fact, does not choose expert workers; it chooses first-class bureaucrats. It would be inhuman if it did not look upon the world with the rather timid eyes of the sedentary clerk. It probably thinks that the world can be saved if a sufficient number of letters and reports are written about it.'

How then, it may be asked, do the anti-bureaucratic Socialists propose that nationalised industries are to be controlled?

In vague terms they reply, as in the speech of Mr. Brace above quoted, that the men who understand the industry, through the fact of working in it with hand or brain, are to control it. A more precise answer, so far at any rate as the coal industry is concerned, is to be found in the evidence put forward before the Coal Commission by Mr. W. Straker, Secretary of the Northumberland Miners' Association, and by Mr. G. D. H. Cole, an Oxford don. The former stated that he was speaking in the name of the Miners' Federation of Great Britain; the latter presumably regards himself as a representative of ideas rather than of persons. Mr. Straker demanded that the mines of the kingdom should be handed over to the control of a Mining Council of ten members, to be presided over by a Minister of Mines. Five members of the Council are to be appointed by the Miners' Federation of Great Britain, the other five by the Minister. The Mining Council is to acquire existing mines and open up new ones; it is to work the mines; it is to acquire or build tramways, railways, ships for the conveyance of coal; it is to undertake the business of selling the coal; and so on, through eleven long clauses with numerous sub-sections.

Curiously enough, however, not a word is said by Mr. Straker as to where the money is to come from. That somewhat important gap in the miners' scheme is bridged by Mr. G. D. H. Cole in his evidence, which is reproduced in a pamphlet on national guilds. Mr. Cole accepts Mr. Straker's main proposals; but he perceives that somebody must be

financially responsible for the commitments of the Mining Council, and he proposes that the State shall be responsible. To quote his words:—'Any surplus of mining revenue over 'expenditure, or of expenditure over revenue, will pass into the 'Budget; and any fresh capital required, whether raised by 'special mining stock or otherwise, will be provided by the State.'* That is quite explicit, but what Mr. Cole and all the anti-bureaucratic Socialists fail to see is, that if the national Budget is to be made responsible for the finances of any industry, Parliament will sooner or later insist on exercising control over that industry. It is inconceivable that the House of Commons would permanently allow any Minister, or any Mining Council, to have an uncontrolled power of spending money which the House will have to vote. Even guild Socialists cannot escape from the fact that sooner or later the man who pays the piper will call the tune.

It is true that under present political conditions Parliament seems to care very little either for the interests of the tax-payer or for the credit of the nation. But these conditions are only possible because private enterprise has created an enormous volume of private wealth for the State to plunder. Under a universal system of nationalisation that private wealth will disappear, and Mr. Cole's somewhat naive suggestion for 'raising special mining stock' will become obviously impracticable. When all or any considerable number of our industries have been nationalised, the State will only be able to obtain money for new developments, or for making good losses on working, by taxing the 'workers'; for there will be nobody else to tax. But, as the attitude of the miners towards the present income tax sufficiently indicates, no proposal to increase the taxation of the whole body of working class voters is likely to be well received in any representative assembly. The House of Commons—if that body is allowed still to exist—will once again use the power of the purse as our ancestors used it, and every State enterprise that comes to Parliament to ask for fresh capital, or to beg for a deficit to be made good, will be called upon to render a strict account of its financial position and prospects.

* 'National Guilds and the Coal Commission,' p. 13.

More than that, Parliament, in order to protect itself in advance from demands involving the taxation of the whole body of voters, will insist on those precautions which experience has proved to be necessary to prevent unauthorised expenditure. In substance those precautions mean, and must mean, some kind of Treasury control; that is to say, the official body which represents the Chancellor of the Exchequer must have power to prevent expenditure. In other words, every proposal for fresh expenditure in nationalised industries will have to be submitted for approval to officials at Whitehall, who will have no knowledge of the industry itself, and whose main duty it will be to save money. The dead hand of bureaucracy will be even heavier than it is to-day.

Nor will the guild Socialist plan avoid the other evil of State control—political influence. If Parliament is to be called upon to provide new capital for industrial guilds, and to make good any deficits on their working, as Mr. G. D. H. Cole stipulates, the 'workers' who are managing the industry will find it necessary to establish friendly relations with members of Parliament, and the various evils of political control will at once follow. The political conscience is as light as the bureaucratic hand is heavy, and a very large number of members of Parliament in all countries seem to think that they are entitled to demand from ministers comfortable berths in the public service for their private friends or for their constituents. That is one of the reasons why the transference of any industry to the State is promptly followed by an increase in the number of officials attached to the industry. The same influence would necessarily operate upon a guild-controlled industry coming to Parliament for money. Such an industry would also be subject to what may be called the higher political influences. Ministers of the Crown are not often much concerned about little jobs of personal patronage, but they are concerned with the effect of any action upon the general fortunes of their party. Suppose the workers in the mining industry want £10,000,000 for new developments, the Cabinet will have to consider that demand, and will very quickly decide that the mass of voters will not understand the merits of a scheme of mining development, but will be politically grateful for cheaper coal. The miners will then be told that

if they wish to have the money for development they must lower the price of coal, even at the cost of their own wages.

There is in fact no escape from the evils of State control under any system of nationalisation which makes the State financially responsible for the industry. If the State is to be the ultimate paymaster, it must insist upon supervising the whole operations of the industry, wherever these operations involve expenditure, or the possibility of expenditure. But if the State is not financially responsible, who is to be? The workers themselves cannot accept the responsibility. A mine, for example, takes about five years to develop. During that period the workers are receiving wages week by week, and not one penny is coming back. If the workers had to provide the money themselves they would have to forego the whole of their wages, and would in most cases then have nothing to live upon.

Thus we are driven back to the private capitalist, *i.e.*, to the person who has saved some of the money that he might have spent, and is willing to lend it to others to spend. He is the person who has hitherto financed all the industries of the nation, and who, to a very large extent, is at this moment financing the nation itself. He lends his money to pay for enterprises which give employment to the wage-earner and create wealth for the whole community. He seldom professes to be a philanthropist. His main purpose is to provide for his own future advantage by foregoing present expenditure. Sometimes he aims at securing a safe competence for his old age; sometimes, with even greater advantage to his country, he acts in the spirit of adventure, risking large losses in the hope of large gains. The latter motive is the mainspring of nearly all new departures in industrial or commercial development. It is also the source of most private fortunes. Possibly, as the Socialists allege, the capitalist, whether aiming at dull security or at speculative fortune, is so morally contemptible a creature that he deserves only abuse if he succeeds, and oblivion if he fails. Nevertheless, the critics of the capitalist would do wisely to reflect that the only alternative to the freedom and elasticity of enterprises financed with private money is the monotonous tyranny of the bureaucratic State.

EDITOR.

No. 472 will be published in April 1920.

209

The Edinburgh Review

APRIL, 1920 No. 472

THE PEACE CONFERENCE AND THE ADRIATIC QUESTION

IN its essence the problem of the Adriatic presented itself to the Peace Conference in the following formula. The Austro-Hungarian Empire had dissolved into its component parts. The provinces of this Empire bordering upon the Adriatic, and inhabited almost exclusively by seven million Southern Slavs, had thereby achieved liberation and claimed union with their Serbian and Montenegrin kinsmen. Italy was opposed to any such complete union as being liable to constitute a menace to her future security. It remained for the Conference at Paris to reconcile the ethnic claims of Yugo-Slavia with the strategic claims of Italy.

How came it that this Adriatic question—a problem in itself scarcely more complicated than that of the Polish frontiers, a controversy at first sight less prejudiced than that of the Saar Basin—should have remained unsolved through all those months of unique opportunity when the destinies of Europe lay in the hands of three men, omnipotent, well intentioned, and unbiased? Such an occasion for justice as was bestowed on these three during the early weeks of 1919 will scarcely again fall to the lot of human statesmen; and yet they failed to achieve their object. They failed, not from ill-intention, not wholly from cowardice, certainly not from lack of information, but from inability to

differentiate principles from facts, or to disentangle the essential moral problem from the flotsam and jetsam of the old diplomacy. They hovered, distressed and hesitating, between two worlds —one dead, the other anxious but powerless to be born. They gazed in sorrow and bewilderment at the countless facets which the question presented, turning the matter listlessly now this way and now that, and from time to time laying it down with a sigh of exhaustion. Eleven vital months had passed before the Adriatic question was grasped as a whole and dealt with jointly by the three Allies; and even then the old cross currents blew up from Downing Street and Rome, and the joint memorandum of 9th December was allowed to crash again into the old tangle of past engagements, compensations, and sectional agreements.

The future historian, reviewing these facts as an isolated problem, containing accepted formulæ leading apparently to perfectly logical conclusions, will doubtless be confounded by what will strike him as the futility, the amazing laxity of the Council of Four in dealing with this question. He will be tempted to search for some far-fetched motives to illuminate their clouded methods; and in doing so he will, to a very great extent, be mistaken. The following pages constitute an endeavour to indicate that the Adriatic problem was not isolated; that in its essence it implied a conflict between Latinity and Slavdom, between different stages of two dissimilar civilisations; that in its developments it stretched from Klagenfurt to Abyssinia; and that in its origins it became entangled by previous engagements, such as the Treaty of London and the arrangement of St. Jean de Maurienne, and with the issue of Franco-Italian relations. The main responsibility will inevitably, but to some extent unjustly, be held to fall upon President Wilson, who hesitated at the initial and so crucial moment at once to isolate the problem, to sever it at a stroke from the entanglements of the past, and to insist on the immediate and public application of his own doctrines. When once this crucial moment had been missed, it was beyond the power of any ordinary statesman to stay the gangrene which set in from all sides, and which poisoned all hope of remedy. Three things alone could have saved the situation if applied simultaneously and at the first moment of the discussion, namely, co-ordination,

speed, and publicity. President Wilson hesitated; and the moment passed.

Before approaching the territorial aspect of the Adriatic question, it is necessary to render some account of the moral factors underlying the whole position. The question of territorial frontiers furnished, indeed, the occasion rather than the cause of the controversy. No explanation of the complexity of the problem would be adequate unless introduced by, and based upon, the vital national convictions which formed the web through which for a whole year the statesmen of Europe passed and repassed the shuttle of compromise and concession. In the end, Fiume, Dalmatia, and the Islands became little more than symbols of a cause—the banner of Yugo-Slav union, the crown of Italian achievement, the doctrine of a new internationalism, the traditions of an old world. Such, and such alone, is the perspective in which the proportions of the question can be adequately considered.

The Italian people had emerged victorious and self-justified from a war of three and a half years, and the sudden annihilation of their hereditary enemy had out-topped their most sanguine expectations. They had suffered as much as any allied nation the horrors of a protracted and uncertain war; they had nobly faced famine, bankruptcy, and internal dissension; they had passed from the nightmare of defeat to the glow of certain victory; they had sustained Caporetto, and had achieved Vittorio Veneto. It was only natural that more moderate counsels should have paled before the flame of a triumphant nationalism.

As applied to the Adriatic, this frame of mind took upon itself a more definite, almost a vindictive complexion. Was it a fit recompense for all she had suffered and achieved, that Italy should merely exchange the Austrian menace for the unknown but apprehended dangers of a greater Yugo-Slavia? Was it fair that, when France and Great Britain were to attain their ambitions and their security, Italy alone should be left with new dangers on her flank, with new enemies to threaten her defenceless eastern seaboard? Up to the very day on which the armistice had been signed, the Yugo-Slavs of Austria had been the most bitter, the most feared of Italy's enemies. Was it reasonable to expect Italy within a few days to turn

round and welcome such enemies with the confidence of a friend and with the generosity of an ally?

The Anglo-Saxon doctrine of nationality rang irritatingly in the ears of the more realistic Italians. Were there not Egypt and Ireland to disprove British idealism, and to prove British hypocrisy? France had been granted equivocal concessions in such matters as the Saar Basin and the occupation of the Rhine. The Fourteen Points had been broken into and pillaged. Even Japan had obtained her share of the booty. Hungary and Austria had been rent and shattered in the interests of the new protégés of American, British, and French capitalism. The Greece of M. Venizelos was emerging rapidly from a Balkan Principality to the status of a great Mediterranean Power. Why should Italy alone of the principal allies be forced to offer living sacrifice in the temple of the Fourteen Points? Why should Italian culture alone be subjected to the domination of a barbarous and inchoate Slav combination? Small wonder that the venerable head of Baron Sonnino should flame with obstinate indignation. Small wonder, alas, that Dante should be forgotten and D'Annunzio acclaimed, or that the teaching of Mazzini should be voiceless in the blare of the 'Idea Nazionale.'

On the other side stood Yugo-Slavia, dazed by the disasters from which she had emerged, bewildered by the brilliant future which now opened before her, and yet calm in the fulfilment of her own history, confident in the justification of her appointed mission.

The early optimism of the Yugo-Slav Delegation in Paris was based on more than merely visionary premises. They realised that their ethnic claims were unanswerable, and they relied on President Wilson, and to a less extent upon France and Great Britain, to see that these claims were realised. How often had the Allied statesmen, amid the plaudits of their peoples, proclaimed that the war was being fought for the liberation of small nationalities! How definitely had President Wilson bound himself to the rigid application of the ethnic principle! Even Italy, only a few months previously, at a time it is true when her prospects were less brilliant, had encouraged and even welcomed the full programme of Yugo-Slav unity. Was it not therefore a most reasonable expectation that a

Conference, summoned under the ægis of the Fourteen Points, would give effect to all these pretensions?

As the Conference proceeded, this early calm was disturbed by the ripple of impending complications. From the first the Yugo-Slavs saw themselves excluded, as a small nation, from the Council which was to decide their own destinies. They looked with growing apprehension on the presence within that Council of Baron Sonnino, the rugged protagonist of 'sacred egoism,' at once the professor and the pupil of the Treaty of London. They knew that public opinion in America, and even in England, was in favour of their cause; they knew that the official experts of the American and British Delegations were well informed and unbiased. But were the four members of the Supreme Council in complete touch with the opinion of their own countries, were they in touch even with the experts of their own Delegations? Outside, in the open air, the whole business appeared simple and inevitable, the logical application of the Fourteen Points to a test case among the very problems for which that doctrine had been elaborated. But might not this simplicity, this inevitable logic, lose something of its force within the hectic atmosphere of M. Pichon's study, or beneath the damask and chandeliers of the Salle de l'Horloge? Gradually there stole over the Yugo-Slavs in Paris a great disillusionment—an immense depression. The dangers for their cause came not only from without; there were disruptive forces working also from within their own hard-won union. Serbia—the Serbia of Belgrade and Pasic—had been the protagonist in the war, and could claim the lead in negotiating the peace. But Belgrade inevitably wore a Balkan aspect, and looked rather for revenge against Bulgaria, for annexations in Northern Albania, than to the creation of a progressive union capable of holding its place among the greater European Powers. It came about therefore that gradually, if only temporarily, the more prudent counsels of the Yugo-Slav Delegation were subordinated to the limited and more militant opinions of the Belgrade politicians. The Yugo-Slavs saw their appeal for a plebiscite refused; they failed to induce the Conference to accept American arbitration. Can we wonder that, for a time at least, and overwhelmed by what appeared to be an orgy of cynicism, they bowed to the Imperialism of Belgrade, and weakened their moral case by claiming territories in Bulgaria

and in Albania which were not ethnically theirs? Out of the welter of bewilderment and distrust into which the Yugo-Slav Delegation were thrown by the proceedings of the Conference, there emerges one figure from whom the ruins of a shattered illusion took nothing of his serenity or moderation. M. Ante Trumbic, a Dalmatian patriot who had been Mayor of Spalato, had done more for Yugo-Slav unity than any other man, except perhaps Frano Supilo, who had died during the war in a London garret while attempting to convince the British Foreign Office of the existence and importance of a Yugo-Slav movement. Trumbic, almost alone of the Yugo-Slavs in Paris, kept his head throughout this lamentable crisis, and he has emerged therefrom as the one unassailable figure among the several personages, reputable or the reverse, who, during the Conference, had a leading voice in the Adriatic settlement.

The above indications will have sufficed to show the attitude of the main protagonists in the controversy. On the one side we have Italy, inspired, and sincerely inspired, by wide national ambitions; ambitions, that is, not necessarily imperialistic, not even nationalist in its strictest meaning, but national in the sense of representing objects convincingly desired by the greater mass of Italian opinion. On the other side we have Yugo-Slavia, a young State having achieved liberation largely by her own efforts, and confident in the undeniable justice of her claim. Between these two extremes, and placed as judges in the controversy, we find America, France, and Great Britain. Before however examining the Allied and Associated attitude towards the question, it is time to study the heads of the precise problem as presented to the Conference, and to indicate the entanglements and ramifications by which this solution was from the first impeded and eventually marred.

In the ultimate analysis, the Yugo-Slav case was presented in terms of population, the Italian case in those of geography. The Yugo-Slavs could ask why, when four million Serbs and Montenegrins had succeeded in liberating seven million of their brethren from Austro-Hungarian rule, the Conference should, in the face of all its pretensions, arbitrarily replace a very considerable proportion of those liberated under another and equally obnoxious alien domination.

The Italians, hesitating to make frank and open use of their

most justifiable argument, that of national security, became entangled in such specious geographical formulæ as the natural frontiers of Italy—the crest of the Alps, from the Brenner along the Rhetian, the Carnic, the Julian to the Dinaric.

In its purely territorial aspect, the question centred around the disposal of the old Austro-Hungarian provinces of Croatia-Slavonia, Dalmatia, Istria, and Carniola, together with the Adriatic islands. The ethnical proportions in the territories chiefly in dispute between the Italians and the Yugo-Slavs can be given as follows :—

Gorizia-Gradisca	Italians,	90,009 = 36	per cent.
	Yugo-Slavs,	154,564 = 61	„
Trieste	Italians,	118,959 = 62.3	„
	Yugo-Slavs,	56,916 = 29.8	„
Istria	Italians,	147,417 = 38	„
	Yugo-Slavs,	223,318 = 57	„

If Istria is divided into two halves, we get :—

Western Zone	Italians,	129,903.	
	Yugo-Slavs,	58,373.	
Eastern Zone	Italians,	6,686.	
	Yugo-Slavs,	135,290.	
Dalmatia	Italians,	18,028 = 2.8	per cent.
	Yugo-Slavs,	610,669 = 96	„

In all the islands, with the exception of Lussin, the Yugo-Slav majority was incontestable. The town of Fiume stood in a somewhat separate category. On the one hand it had for many decades enjoyed a special status ('corpus separatum') within the Hungarian system ; on the other hand, the ethnical statistics were hotly contested. If one took the figures for Fiume itself, the proportion was as follows :—

Italians	24,212
Yugo-Slavs	15,687
Italian majority	8,525

The Yugo-Slavs argued however that it was impossible to separate Fiume either from its suburbs or from the hinterland,

and even if the immediate suburb of Susak were alone included, the proportion of the whole was reversed as follows:—

Italians - - - -	25,781
Yugo-Slavs - - - -	26,602
Slav majority - -	821

It was obvious moreover that on the fringes of these territories, in the western part of Istria, and to a lesser degree on the Dalmatian seaboard, the two races were found to be inextricably mingled. In order that no Slavs should be left outside Yugo-Slavia, it would have been necessary for the latter to incorporate some 350,000 Italians. If on the other hand all Italians were to be joined to Italy, the latter would at the same time have had to annex some 700,000 Yugo-Slavs.

Some compromise as regards the territories upon the fringe of Yugo-Slavia and Italy was thus imposed from the first, and from the first the Yugo-Slavs signified their readiness to sacrifice 400,000 of their number to the needs of such a compromise. Further, although the territory in dispute stretched in theory from Venice to Albania, in practice certain axioms existed which from the outset confined the problem within more reasonable limits. It was from the first admitted that Trieste and Pola, with their large Italian population, and still larger Italian interests, should go to Italy. It was obvious moreover that the railway connecting these two ports, and cutting the Istrian Peninsula into two halves, should also be included in Italian territory. It was felt also that it would not in practice be possible to give to Yugo-Slavia the Slav settlement around Friuli within the old Italian frontier, and it was foreseen that the Italian claim to Gorizia and Gradisca, as forming the hinterland of Trieste, could, in spite of their Slav population, in practice be scarcely resisted.

From the outset therefore the problem was narrowed down to the attribution of the territory lying between the River Arsa on the eastern tip of the Istrian Peninsula, and the old Albanian frontier in the south.

Such in its simplest form was the problem which confronted the Conference in January of last year. The difficulty regarding

those portions of territories where the two races overlapped, could easily be met by the sacrifices which the Yugo-Slavs were already known to have agreed to. It appeared not impossible to satisfy Italian strategic apprehensions by giving them Pola, the islands of Lussin and Lissa, and the bay of Vallona. If more were needed, certain portions of the Yugo-Slav coast could be demilitarised; in fact, if Italy consented, and why should she not consent, the whole Adriatic might be permanently neutralised under the guarantee of the League of Nations. As has already been indicated, if President Wilson had from the outset taken a firm and open stand upon such a solution, agreement might readily have been achieved. But for this two essentials were necessary; unity of action, as between the three Western Powers, and rapidity of execution. Why was neither of these essentials forthcoming at the crucial moment? The explanation is not hard to seek; it resides in the Treaty of London, and in the cumbrous and narrow-minded methods of Conference procedure.

By the Treaty of London, signed in April 1915, under which Italy had come into the war, France, Russia, and Great Britain had promised that Italy should annex the Trentino and Southern Tyrol up to the Brenner, the counties of Gorizia and Gradisca, the whole of Istria south-west of the Julian Alps to a point just west of Fiume, and the islands of Lussin, Cherso, Lissa, Curzola, and Meleda. In addition to this she was to be given the whole of Northern Dalmatia, including Zara and Sebenico. The treaty contained other provisions. It provided that in the event of a partition of the Ottoman Empire, Italy should receive, in the region of Adalia, similar additions to those which might be secured by the other signatories in Asia Minor. It provided also, although in a vague manner, that the claims of Italy in Africa should be given favourable consideration. It implied finally that Albania should be partitioned between Serbia, Italy, and Greece. One redeeming point of the treaty, as judged by present standards, was that it explicitly stated that the Port of Fiume should go in complete sovereignty to Croatia.

The effect of this treaty, as regards the Adriatic, would have been to place upwards of 700,000 Yugo-Slavs under Italian rule without any opportunity being given for these populations to express their own wishes in the matter. It was hoped by many

of the Americans, and even by some of the British, who came to Paris in January 1919, that this dangerous obstruction would from the outset be removed from the path of an Adriatic settlement. It was hoped that Italy herself would realise that in the last event she would not have the strength to force such a bargain upon united Yugo-Slav opposition. It was felt above all that the Treaty of London had been concluded under conditions which had now been altered, and that France and Great Britain had every justification in calling for a fresh deal.

For such a hope there existed considerable foundation. Apart from the intrinsic injustice of the treaty itself, the circumstances under which it had been concluded had entirely altered. The Treaty of London had been drawn up on the tacit assumption that the war would not be of long duration, and that Austria-Hungary would emerge therefrom weakened, but still existent. The complete dissolution of the former Empire, and the consequent establishment of a great Yugo-Slav State, were not considered within the range of practical politics; and Sir Edward Grey had doubtless felt that Italy had some justification for claiming complete military and naval security against the Austria-Hungary of the future and for establishing herself firmly on the flank of any German penetration to the East. This basic assumption, which lay at the root of the treaty, had been swept aside by the long duration and the final result of the war, but there were other circumstances also which completely altered the contractual value of the Treaty of London. In the first place, by the Declaration of Corfu in July 1917, the Serbs, the Croats, and the Slovenes had agreed to form a united Yugo-Slav kingdom, and all that this pact implied had been welcomed and encouraged by responsible Italian statesmen at the Conference of Rome in April 1918. Further, the entry of America into the war, and the acceptance by the Italian Government of the Fourteen Points of President Wilson, had introduced into Western diplomacy a new spirit of justice and renunciation.

It was felt therefore in some quarters that the statesmen of France and Great Britain might well have placed the whole Adriatic question on a more logical basis from the outset of the Conference. They could have argued that the circumstances under which the Treaty of London had been negotiated had

radically changed, that the Italian Government had subsequently given its assent to other principles of policy which were in complete contradiction to the principles underlying the treaty, and that although the original treaty might well figure in the discussion, it should figure only as one of a group of factors of which subsequent declarations and engagements constituted more important elements. Had M. Clemenceau and Mr. Lloyd George taken this line in the first days of the Conference, it can scarcely be doubted that they would have secured the support of President Wilson, and that it would have been impossible for Baron Sonnino to have resisted the moral pressure to which he would thereby have been exposed. The Adriatic question would then have come before the Conference as an almost open one, and would not have been subjected to the reservations, the hesitancies, and the various sectional negotiations which proved so fatal.

Mr. Lloyd George and M. Clemenceau had not however the foresight or the courage to take this line. They were anxious indeed to secure from President Wilson his assent in matters where British and French interests were more directly concerned, and they hesitated to venture on the thin ice of the Adriatic settlement until their own preoccupations had been allayed. They entrenched themselves therefore behind the apparently reasonable contention that their Governments had both signed the Treaty of London, and that it was not for them to back out of the word which they had given. At best, their attitude may have been inspired by a faint hope that the Italians would themselves offer an escape from the difficulties in which they were placed; alternatively, they may have thought that President Wilson would initiate a revision of the whole treaty, and that they could then point to his intervention as a reason for going back upon their signatures.

Less creditably they may have looked with uneasy eyes upon the non-European clauses of this treaty; upon the promises made to Italy in Asia Minor, the assurances given to her in regard to the colonies. Was there not a danger that if they repudiated the European part of the treaty, Italy would insist with all the more vehemence on the execution of its extra-European terms? Conversely, would it not be wiser, even at the expense of the Yugo-Slavs, to avoid joining issue with Italy

in Europe and to trust to her gratitude to let France off colonial concessions in Africa and to free Mr. Lloyd George from the promises he had so lightly given at St. Jean de Maurienne? After all, they argued, there was no immediate hurry. The Adriatic question had nothing to do with the German Treaty, and it was as regards the German Treaty that public opinion in France and Great Britain was becoming so impatient. Would it not be better to secure Baron Sonnino's co-operation until those portions of the German Treaty in which France and Great Britain were more directly interested had been satisfactorily disposed of? It is probable that Mr. Lloyd George quite honestly failed to realise the dangers of delay. M. Clemenceau, who was too experienced not to foresee these dangers, hesitated to embitter Franco-Italian relations at a moment when he was being exposed to such difficulties with his American and British colleagues. With a sigh of relief Mr. Lloyd George and M. Clemenceau found that there existed many weighty and excellent reasons which could readily be adduced as a justification for waiting.

President Wilson, on the other hand, with that sincere, if somewhat intermittent, diffidence which was one of the surprises of the Conference, hesitated until it was too late to impose his own solution on his expectant colleagues. The machine was ready, nay anxiously awaited, but the god was occupied elsewhere. For even President Wilson in those early winter days had his personal preoccupations. There was the Covenant of the League to steer through the rocks and shallows of 'European 'diplomacy'—that bogey by which the Americans were at first so unnecessarily frightened. There were the Fourteen Points (they were still alive at that time) to protect against the continuous sapping of the Council of Four. There was finally that whole distressing process by which the values of the new world were being adjusted to the processes and standards of the old. President Wilson found it easier to take at their face value the statements of M. Clemenceau and Mr. Lloyd George regarding the Treaty of London. He decided to negotiate alone and secretly with the Italians in the hope of inducing them to accept a reasonable compromise.

The attitude of Baron Sonnino was at once more definite and more consistent. He found himself from the first in an

extremely difficult position. The objects at which he aimed, of which the Adriatic question formed only a part, could not even by the most subtle of formulæ be made to square with the Fourteen Points. He wanted to secure Southern Tyrol up to the Brenner, but that would mean annexing 243,000 Germans. He wanted to obtain a strategic land and sea frontier against Yugo-Slavia, but that unfortunately would also entail the annexation of 700,000 Yugo-Slavs. Italy wanted Albania, but the Albanians were beginning quite definitely not to want Italy. Even in the wider field of Asia and Africa the Italian claims clashed, sometimes with the vital interests of her two principal allies, sometimes with the ethnic rights of Greece. Nowhere could Baron Sonnino find a free or unopposed outlet for his country's ambitions. Behind it all stood the spectre of Italy's economic subservience to her Western Allies. Never, since the days of Talleyrand, had a statesman entered a European Congress with less brilliant prospects.

As against these overwhelming difficulties, the Italian Foreign Minister possessed but few tangible assets. There was the position of Italy as a Great Power; there was her splendid record in the war; there was the nebulous bond of Franco-Italian amity; finally, there was the Treaty of London and the agreement of St. Jean de Maurienne. That was all. Baron Sonnino held few good cards, but he played them, at least at first, with quite amazing dexterity.

He realised from the outset that his only hope lay in a policy of disintegration and delay. If once President Wilson could induce France and Great Britain to act simultaneously and expeditiously, if once the Italian case with all its fallacies was visualised as a whole, there would remain little prospect of a satisfactory issue. As against a joint presentation of the Fourteen Points he was all but powerless; if once however he could manœuvre the situation on to the familiar ground of separate negotiations he felt, and he felt rightly, that he would be supreme.

With this in mind he refused from the first to commit himself to any comprehensive statement of the Italian programme. He was careful indeed not to state specifically whether he actually desired the application of the Treaty of London (he knew too well that this treaty would entail an

eventual war with Yugo-Slavia and an immediate loss of Fiume), but he used that instrument to silence France and Great Britain while he treated alone with President Wilson. His policy was to deal piecemeal with the whole question; piecemeal, in the sense not only of playing off one of his allies against the other, but also of detaching the various items of his own programme so that what he might gain in one quarter should not be used to balance what he might claim in another. He thus succeeded, to the surprise of the world, and while the Conference was still young, in securing President Wilson's assent to the Brenner frontier without apparently having been obliged to give in return any promises regarding Dalmatia or Fiume. He then proceeded to play skilfully for time, in order that the effect of this great concession should wear off before discussions opened on the equally debatable ground of the Adriatic. Through all this his colleagues on the Supreme Council played continuously into his hand.

Having secured, and apparently for nothing, the Southern Tyrol, with its quarter of a million Germans, and having decided to lie low for the present as regards the other items of his programme, Baron Sonnino proceeded to organise Italian public opinion for the impending struggle. He realised that the economic future of Trieste would be severely hampered if Fiume remained to Yugo-Slavia. He saw that to retain the portion of Dalmatia given him by the Treaty of London would mean possible war with Yugo-Slavia. He desired therefore to exchange Dalmatia for Fiume, but in order to do this certain preliminary propaganda was essential. Italian public opinion had scarcely thought of Fiume during the war; it must at once be made to think of nothing else. The circumstances of the occupation of Fiume after the armistice assisted him in this policy. In November 1918 a Serbian battalion was in occupation of Fiume, and Italian troops were in close proximity. As a conflict between the two forces was to be apprehended, it was agreed, owing to the intervention of British and French officers, that the Serbians should evacuate the town on condition that Italian troops should not enter it. The Italian Admiral gave his word of honour to that effect, but immediately on the Serbian evacuation his superior officer stated that he had acted without instructions, and the Italian troops entered the town. When

once in occupation it was easy for them to secure the election of a National Council of their own design, and to induce this Council to vote for union with Italy. It was thus possible for Baron Sonnino to claim that on the principle of self-determination Fiume desired to be joined to Italy, and to direct his propaganda in these channels.

So far we have seen Baron Sonnino as the astute and experienced diplomatist of the old school. But there was another and somewhat perplexing side to his character. Of Judæo-Italian-Levantine descent on the one side, of Scotch ancestry on the other, he combined the rancorous subtlety of the one with the excessive obstinacy of the other. This combination in the end proved his ruin. The agitation which he had inspired in Italy rapidly swelled beyond control. By July it had led to the massacre of French soldiers in Fiume, by September to the raid of Gabriele d'Annunzio. Nor was this all. His honest indignation at what he took to be the hypocrisy of his colleagues gradually induced in him a mood of petty and rancorous annoyance. On nearly every question, in nearly every region of the globe, in the Council of Four, in the Committees of the Conference, in the Italian Press, in every organ of Italian official and unofficial expression, no opportunity was wasted of obstructing or defaming the work of President Wilson and of the two Western Powers. Constant reports were received from Hungary, from Bulgaria, and from Turkey, of Italian manœuvres not only against the Yugo-Slavs, not even only against the Greeks, but also directly against the general interests of the Alliance. The cumulative effect of these petty obstructions and these discreditable annoyances was that there grew up within the Conference a wave of opposition to Italy, and a feeling of the very gravest mistrust of Baron Sonnino's principles and policy.

It was in this unhealthy atmosphere, and amid a general feeling of tension and irritation, that towards the beginning of April the Adriatic question came up for discussion.

It is not possible, or even desirable, to trace in detail the intricate course of the negotiations which now opened. On the one hand the official sources of information, even if they exist, are not available; on the other hand even those paths which

we can follow are confused by wide lacunæ, or blurred by subsequent retracing. The kaleidoscopic nature of the negotiations is amazing; not only does the basis of the negotiations change suddenly from day to day, but the negotiators themselves pass and repass across the stage without apparent intention, leaving unsaid the rôle which was expected of them. Week by week also we find fresh hands taking up some new end of the tangled skein, only to abandon their half-completed task to other investigators. It is more satisfactory to ignore these countless by-paths, to group the negotiations somewhat arbitrarily into definite periods, and to mark those periods by such important pronouncements or events as can furnish milestones in that long and disastrous circuit by which the Supreme Council have at last worked round to their point of departure.

Such a system, however convenient in itself, must of necessity give but a faint picture of the method, or lack of method, under which the Conference conducted its labours. The picture, to be accurate, should reflect the general atmosphere of overwork and pressure which was the main cause of what might otherwise appear gratuitous. It should above all give some account of the mutual relations of the several expert delegations, and the extent to which their industry was rewarded by the confidence or even the attention of their chiefs. Such a digression is beyond the purpose of this article. Let it be understood however that behind the Supreme Council laboured the staffs of their respective delegations—and that of all the work done at Paris this labour, unceasing and often unheeded, was what was most efficient and most honest.

Our present purpose is however to discuss the treatment of the Adriatic question by the Conference of Paris, and for history the Conference of Paris can only be the Supreme Council. As has already been said the negotiations can most conveniently be divided into periods, and the following classification most readily suggests itself:—

First Period—January 1919 *to June* 1919.

This period may be called the period of Baron Sonnino, and its effects have already been discussed in the paragraphs devoted to the policy of that statesman. It is marked by the skilful

separation of France and Great Britain from America, and the reduction of the two former Powers to silence by the use of the Treaty of London. It is marked further by the instigation of a wild nationalist propaganda in Italy, centring on the acquisition of Fiume, and by the obstructive and even provocative attitude adopted by Italy in all questions affecting her Allies. Throughout this period Baron Sonnino, having secured the Southern Tyrol, was adopting dilatory tactics as regards the Adriatic. While in appearance lending himself to President Wilson's desire for separate discussions between America and Italy, he was in practice determined not to allow these discussions to succeed until Italy had also obtained her desires in Asia and Africa. While from time to time agreeing to the President's insistence on triangular negotiations with the Yugo-Slavs, he refused to accord the latter even an opening for a reasonable compromise. In the end the President, losing all patience, appealed over the head of the Italian Government to the Italian people—but by then the agitation in Italy had reached such a point that this appeal did far more harm than good. The period concluded with the fall of Baron Sonnino, and was followed on 6th July by the massacre of French soldiers at Fiume.

There is one document which emerges from this nebulous and unsatisfactory period which deserves special attention, namely, President Wilson's memorandum of 15th April, which saw the birth of the famous 'Wilson Line' in Istria. This line, while leaving to Italy Trieste and Pola, and enough territory to safeguard the railway joining these two, adopted a more satisfactory ethnical frontier in the Istrian peninsula, and left to Yugo-Slavia the port of Fiume, and the Fiume-Laibach Railway. It departed above all from the line of the Treaty of London by pushing the Italian frontier further to the west in the neighbourhood of Fiume, and thus safeguarding that city from the menace of the Italian occupation of the Monte Maggiore. President Wilson's memorandum insisted moreover on the abandonment by Italy of her claim to Northern Dalmatia and all the islands except Lussin and Lissa. In return, Italian strategic requirements could be met by the processes of demilitarisation, and reduction of the Yugo-Slav fleet.

Second Period—June 1919 *to September* 1919.

With the departure of Baron Sonnino and the arrival of Signor Tittoni in his place a new atmosphere descended upon the discussion. Signor Tittoni was of a less rugged character than his predecessor, and realised that no solution would be possible without a reversal of Baron Sonnino's obstructive methods. He was equally determined not to accept the solution proposed by President Wilson, but his methods were completely different. Instead of silencing France and England with the threat of the Treaty of London, he decided to draw them into the discussion, and to use Franco-Italian relations as a means of securing French assistance against America. In this policy he was warmly assisted by M. André Tardieu, who at this stage acted as an able mediator between the two extremes of American and Italian mentality.

When once the Treaty of London had been shelved, the question of Dalmatia also fell into the background, and the discussions centred around the fate of Fiume and the 'Wilson 'line' in Istria. Some account has already been given of the ethnical position in Fiume, and of the circumstances in which the Municipal Council had voted for union with Italy. The economic aspect however was scarcely less important, since Fiume constituted the only practical outlet for northern Yugo-Slavia, and since it would take years to construct any alternative harbour at such places as Senj or Buccari. The Italians on the other hand contested that the 'Wilson line' in Istria did not give sufficient military protection to the Trieste-Pola Railway.

It appeared to M. Tardieu that both these difficulties could be met, if Fiume and a large strip of the hinterland could be formed into a separate independent State under the League of Nations. On the one hand Yugo-Slavia would thereby gain a secured economic outlet; on the other hand Italy would be provided with a neutralised buffer State to protect the Trieste-Pola Railway. During August and September the wires hummed between the Crillon and Washington in regard to this proposal. The President was not opposed in principle—but would there be an eventual plebiscite in this artificial State? What would be the status of Fiume town within this independent

territory? There appeared to be no end to such questions and answers, and the wires were still humming when on 12th September Gabriele d'Annunzio entered Fiume and proclaimed its annexation to Italy.

Third Period—12th September to 9th December 1919.

The arrival of d'Annunzio at Fiume put an abrupt conclusion to these negotiations. His action was a direct defiance of Yugo-Slavia—a direct insult to the Conference. No further discussion could take place until the situation had been regulated. Signor Tittoni begged the Conference to be patient, to give Italy a little time and all would be well. M. Clemenceau grumbled but consented—after all Signor Tittoni had been so conciliatory and all this must, for him, be extremely awkward. The Conference agreed therefore to wait; they waited two months. The Yugo-Slavs, to their credit, also consented to allow Italy to settle alone with d'Annunzio.

By the middle of October signs of impatience became manifest at Washington. Was nothing to be done for an Adriatic settlement? Did England and France intend to remain purely quiescent? The Italians, realising that a further movement was developing to hasten a solution, presented a further proposal. While accepting the original buffer State proposed by M. Tardieu they suggested that Fiume should have a separate municipal status within that State, and should be joined to Italy by a thin band of territory running along the coast. They also asked for the islands of Lussin, Cherso, Lissa, and Lagosta. Zara in Dalmatia was to be a free city under Italian diplomatic protection. Meanwhile they again resorted to their former policy of separate conversations. They flitted between the Crillon, the Astoria, and the Quai d'Orsay, giving to each delegation different versions of what President Wilson had promised, of what they were prepared to offer, of what France and Great Britain thought a just solution. The confusion became worse than ever.

By this time however the old Council of Four had changed its complexion. M. Clemenceau was still there, but President Wilson was in Washington, and Mr. Lloyd George was in London. Mr. Polk, the chief American representative, became

irritated at this lack of procedure. He insisted on a frank statement of what Italy did actually desire in return for a frank statement of what America was prepared to accept. It was on the firm basis of the facts as thus presented that the memorandum of 9th December was drafted and signed by the representatives of America, France, and Great Britain.

This memorandum, which represented the sanest attempt yet made to find a compromise, is of considerable importance. After reviewing the points on which an agreement had already been reached between Italy and America, the memorandum criticised in the most categorical language the Italian request that Fiume should be separated from the buffer State and joined to Italy by a thin band of territory running along the coast between the road and the railway. This latter suggestion was characterised as running 'counter to every known consideration of geography, 'economics, and territorial convenience.' An equally firm attitude was adopted in regard to the Italian claim for certain further Yugo-Slav islands, and a note was annexed which in effect limited the terms of the Italian Mandate over Albania. Great hopes were entertained as to the value and success of the memorandum of 9th December, but these hopes were doomed to early disappointment. A few weeks after the signature of the memorandum of 9th December, the Prime Ministers of France, Italy, and Great Britain met together in Paris, and without consulting America (one of the co-signatories of the joint memorandum), proceeded to jettison the theory of the buffer State, and to accept the suggestion of Italian territorial connexion with Fiume by that very band of territory which they had so recently criticised. Further, the assent of Yugo-Slavia, or rather of Belgrade, to the loss of Fiume was to be bought by the accession to her of Northern Albania and the consequent partition of that unfortunate country. This arrangement, which is known as the compromise of 14th January, was to be imposed upon the Yugo-Slavs under the threat of the alternative application of the Treaty of London.

The sudden abandonment of the memorandum of 9th December aroused, as is well known, the most violent protest on the part of President Wilson. In his note of 10th February the President drew attention to the fact that behind his back the Prime Ministers of France and Great Britain had decided to

modify in certain vital respects the 9th December memorandum, and to enforce conditions which were not in accordance either with reason or with justice. He characterised the settlement proposed as one which 'both in the terms of its provisions and 'the methods of its enforcement constitutes a positive denial of 'the principles for which America entered the war,' and he threatened that if his associates refused to listen to him he would withdraw from the Treaty with Germany and the agreement between the United States and France of June 1919. This bombshell on the part of President Wilson brought the Adriatic question to a rapid if ineffectual *dénouement.* There remained nothing to do but to give way. In their note of 26th February the Prime Ministers of France and Great Britain offered to withdraw the compromise of 14th January, and to allow Italy and Yugo-Slavia to come to a direct arrangement between themselves. They at the same time intimated that the memorandum of 9th December should similarly be abandoned, and they implied that if the direct negotiations between Italy and Yugo-Slavia were not successful it would be incumbent upon Italy's two Allies to go back to the Treaty of London. In his reply to this President Wilson, while welcoming the suggestion of direct negotiations between Italy and Yugo-Slavia, maintained that the memorandum of 9th December represented a definite statement of policy which could not in this irresponsible way be abandoned, and that in any case the Treaty of London was not an instrument which America could recognise or support. Thus, after eleven months of negotiation, the Supreme Council returned, annoyed and humiliated, to their original point of departure.

The reason underlying the curious fiasco of the negotiations which took place between 9th December and 26th February must still remain shrouded in mystery. How came it that Mr. Lloyd George, who by then had become President of the Supreme Council, could have violated the rudimentary principles of prudence and courtesy to the extent of ignoring America's whole position in the Adriatic discussion and her signature of the memorandum of 9th December? It has been suggested as an explanation for this curious procedure that Mr. Lloyd George had entered into some personal compact with Signor Nitti by which, in return for Great Britain's support against the Yugo-

Slavs, Mr. Lloyd George could count on Signor Nitti's sympathy in his offensive against France over the Russian and Turkish questions. If this is the explanation, Mr. Lloyd George's conduct of this personal and secret policy was exceedingly amateurish and exceedingly unsuccessful. The immediate result of his methods was to face an astonished world with the danger of rupture between America and Europe. The ultimate conclusion has been the capitulation of the three Prime Ministers to President Wilson. Meanwhile the Adriatic question had been caught in all these currents of personal politics, so that those who should have steered it into port have been obliged to leave it derelict.

We cannot ourselves believe that the above is the true explanation of Mr. Lloyd George's attitude. The British Prime Minister personally conceived and executed many just and admirable arrangements during the course of the Peace Conference. He has always been regarded as a true friend of America; he has always been admired as a champion of small nationalities. Could such a man have insulted America at a crucial moment or have sacrificed Northern Albania gratuitously to a detested alien rule? If Mr. Lloyd George has, in fact, done both these things, it is incredible that the explanation thereof should be so flimsy as that of a personal combine with Signor Nitti against M. Millerand, or petty irritation against the United States. There must be other reasons underlying his policy, and until these reasons are known it is impossible to criticise or even to comment on his action. One criticism however may certainly be permitted. The methods and procedure by which the negotiations have of late been conducted, and the strange ineptitude through which the matter was suddenly allowed to develop into a serious international complication between America and Europe, raises many doubts as to the value and prudence of hurried personal negotiations, which seem, alas, to constitute the only real difference between the new diplomacy and the old. A little foresight, a little method, would have rendered unnecessary the conflict which arose on both shores of the Atlantic and have prevented the Adriatic question from becoming further envenomed and more heavily biased.

It is impossible at present to predict the future of the negotiations which are now to be undertaken direct between

Italy and Yugo-Slavia. Such negotiations were frequently attempted during the course of the Conference but failed invariably owing to the fact that the Italians relied for their support upon the Treaty of London, and the Yugo-Slavs looked for assistance to the principles of President Wilson. The results of the Conference of London have merely tended to emphasise these two divergent aspects. On the other hand both sides are anxious, and indeed determined, to secure some sort of peace within their own countries. Moreover, Signor Nitti may succeed in delivering a surprise attack upon the Yugo-Slavs by reopening the whole question of the Hungarian frontiers. The next few weeks will show whether these direct negotiations are pregnant with some fruitful solution or whether they are to be regarded as merely one of those long pauses which have hitherto followed upon the periodic tempests to which the Prime Ministers of the Great Powers have exposed themselves in their conduct of the Adriatic negotiations.

16*th March* 1920.

THE FUTURE OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

1. **The League of Nations.** By Dr. OPPENHEIM. Longmans, Green. 1919.
2. **The Society of Nations.** By Dr. LAWRENCE. New York: Oxford University Press. 1919.

THE founders of the League of Nations have declared that the peace of the future must rest upon 'the firm establishment of the understandings of International Law as the 'actual rule of conduct among Governments,' and the community of nations is now being organised to this end. Although the United States is hesitating between a new foreign policy and the old policy of American isolation, and although the diplomacy of some European capitals is out of harmony with the spirit of the Covenant, the League has been formally launched with the support of a considerable body of opinion in all countries, and a war-weary world supplies a promising field for its early activities. The times invite the study of International Law and prompt reflections upon its future. But by singular mischance two of its most eminent spokesmen in England, Dr. Lawrence and Dr. Oppenheim, Whewell Professor in the University of Cambridge, have died within a few months of one another. The need for such men and their writings, as, for instance, Lawrence's 'Society of Nations' or Oppenheim's last published work, 'The League of Nations,' to give direction and guidance is greater than ever before. For it would indeed be dangerous to presume too much upon the war-weariness of to-day, or to construe as a permanent change of outlook what may prove to be only a reaction of feeling.

After the great upheaval of Europe during the Napoleonic wars a similar reaction towards law and peace took place. A manifesto proclaimed to the world that the sovereigns of the five great States in their union at the Conference of Aix-la-Chapelle had no other object than the maintenance of peace on the basis of existing treaties. They had formed no new political combinations; their rule was the observance of international

law; their object the prosperity and moral welfare of their subjects. Yet within a year or two political reaction had reached its full tide in Europe.* In the twentieth century the danger does not appear to lie in the direction of absolutism, and it may be that the instability of some newly formed democratic States may provoke more crises during this generation than the greed or repression of arbitrary monarchs. But whatever the provocation, the causes which underlie the renewal of a spirit of war in the world are fundamentally the same. With the passage of years war seems to lose its naked horror. History is flushed with the glow of achievement, and its tints become the soft tints of a time long ago. Men no longer come home from the trenches with their sobering tale. Old warriors romance or forget. The instinct of youth and the aspirations of the nation dispute the wisdom of those who teach lessons of peace. These lessons are written with pathetic insistence in many a preamble to a treaty of peace—written and forgotten.

The factors which govern the making of history are beyond the reach of the characteristic movements of one century or another; they ignore Europe's changing phases of vigour or fatigue. Some such thought as this is stirred by Oppenheim's study of the League of Nations idea in its beginning, and of its age-long struggle with the spirit that breeds strife: 'The con-'ception of a League of Nations is very old, is indeed as old as 'modern International Law.' Pierre Dubois, Antoine Marini, Sully, Emeric Crucé—their dreams should bring disillusionment to some who during the past five years have claimed originality for present schemes. Oppenheim has something to say too on the function of war in history, not less valuable because the words were written before hostilities ended: 'All States were originally 'founded on force . . . Most of the States in Europe are the 'product of the activity of strong dynasties . . . through war 'and conquest and through marriage and purchase.' Religious, dynastic, and colonial wars, wars for the attainment of national unity—how little their makers were disturbed in victory or defeat by the dreamers of leagues of peace. But some men in all ages have seen such visions, and Lawrence and Oppenheim were among them; now their spirit has caught

* Fyffe, 'Modern Europe.' 1892. Vol. ii. 134, 163.

the popular fancy, and some of their desires are to be put to proof.

Instant and complete success cannot be expected. Neither the subtlety of men of affairs, nor their enthusiasm, nor the goodwill of the peoples behind them can solve outright the problems which spring from the depths of human nature, and from the contradictions of love and hate in the relations of man to man. The League of Nations is a first experiment, and already heavy burdens have been cast upon it. For fifteen years it is responsible for the government of the Saar Basin. At the end of that time, when Germany may well be recovering from her present economic ruin, and many years of peace may perhaps have intervened to make the lessons of the recent war forgotten, the League is charged with the task of allocating this prized area between the two rival claimants. The city of Danzig, a German city forming Poland's natural outlet to the sea, is placed under the protection of the League, though its foreign relations and the interests of its subjects abroad are in the hands of Poland. Provisions for safeguarding the rights of minorities in Austria, Roumania, and other States of Central Europe and the Balkans, the protection of Jews in Poland and of Mussalmans in the Serb-Croat-Slovene State are placed under the guarantee of the League, and differences are to be referred to the Permanent Court of International Justice.

These and many other responsibilities, fraught with dangers of which history is eloquent, are laid upon the League by the Treaties of Peace, in addition to its principal task of promoting the peace and security of nations. It is no wonder that writers of distinction, here and in the United States, have urged the separation of the Covenant from the Treaties. But the Treaties themselves, not it would seem without deliberate purpose, have effectually provided against such a ruthless endeavour. Every part, every section is interwoven with the League. 'These com-'promises, which have been the subject of so much criticism,' a writer in the *Times New Year Supplement* truly remarked with reference to the frontiers of France and the territory of Poland, 'have this in common, that their success depends entirely on the 'establishment and efficiency of the League of Nations.' Any attempt to excise the League must involve the existing Treaties in disaster.

But the League may fail in one or many of these arduous duties. Doubtless, the proper moral of any such failure would be that the system was on its first trial, and that the measure of success already achieved should encourage further effort. But there is much danger that disappointment might turn the nations against the instrument which they have created, visiting upon it the penalty more justly due to their own defects of temper. During the progress of the recent war, an error of this sort was made in some neutral countries, where speakers and writers were apt to lay the blame for the conflict, not upon the guilty spirit of aggression in the diplomacy of the Central Powers, but upon the system of the Balance of Power. This tendency must have been in part responsible for the general discredit into which that doctrine, which had guided European diplomacy since the Treaty of Westphalia, has now fallen in all countries alike. Yet the principle of the Balance of Power was recognised by the Peace of Utrecht as one without which the law of nations could not exist, and it has since won approval in many international agreements. It was applied at the Congress of Vienna, and in the various resettlements of the nineteenth century, when attempts were made to distribute political power evenly among States, so that they should be deterred from disturbing the peace by fear of one another. These arrangements may well have contributed materially to the peace of Europe; but they failed in 1914, and in that terrible failure forfeited the good opinion of the world.

The settlement of 1919, in so far as it has risen above the imperious demands of compromise, rests upon three principles, two wholly new, and one of comparatively modern origin. These are respect for nationalities, the establishment of a League of Nations, and reliance upon the United States as a disinterested party to hold the balance between rival European Powers. The last principle, whether or not any success attends the present attempt to secure its application, is in conflict with the American tradition of foreign policy; it is based neither upon the lessons of history nor upon the general characteristics of human nature, and is unlikely to outlive the men who have devised it. But the principle of the League is rooted in the past, and reason lends it support. It holds more promise for the future, and is the main foundation of the new order.

The new structure is generally thought to differ essentially

from the old order supported by the Balance of Power. But how far is the new League really different from the old Balance?

From the arrangements of 1815, under which the greater States of Europe were balanced one against the other, it followed that the principal Powers, whenever they happened to be united on a policy, could put irresistible pressure on smaller States. Under such conditions the evolution of the European Concert was logically inevitable, and in fact its growth was rapid. After the work of the Vienna Congress was finished, the four Great Powers which had been victorious in the Napoleonic wars, Great Britain, Russia, Prussia, and Austria, through the united action of their ambassadors at Paris, kept careful watch over the restored Bourbon monarchy and the general execution of the Treaty. 'Paris however was not the only field for a busy 'diplomacy,' and in spite of many conflicts of aim and supposed interest, the four States, together with France, which was admitted to their counsels in 1818, maintained sufficient harmony to assume and enforce an informal control over the affairs of lesser Europe. For a time they worked on behalf of the principle of legitimacy. Later, in spite of serious dissensions, they devised through skilful diplomacy a common policy towards Holland and Belgium and the changing phases of the Eastern Question. Their precarious harmony was interrupted for several years from 1848 onwards, and wars intervened. After the war of 1870 between France and Prussia, Russia saw an opportunity in the embarrassments of Western Europe to pursue her own policy in the Balkans. But in 1878 the Great Powers assembled once more for concerted action, and were joined by Italy as a new member of the European Concert. Russia agreed to abandon arrangements which could not be upheld in face of the united opposition of the other Powers. Thus the Berlin Congress was able to control the map of Europe, and settled the future of Roumania, Serbia, and Montenegro without even inviting these small States to accede to the Treaty.

A few years later the Great Powers, this time assisted by the United States which signed but did not ratify their General Act, and by some of the smaller States, turned their united attention to the settlement of Africa. In 1897 war between Greece and Turkey induced them to intervene once more in Balkan affairs. Indeed their primacy, which was the natural outcome of the

policy adopted at the Congress of Vienna, and from that time dominated European diplomacy, continued down to the outbreak of war in 1914. But it was threatened early in the twentieth century by signs of internal strife. In 1908 the Concert had been unable or reluctant to restrain Austria from a flagrant breach in the arrangements which it had made at Berlin thirty years before. In 1911 rivalry between France and Germany, which had for a time been mitigated by the Algeciras Act, broke out again with critical vehemence. Finally in 1914 the Concert of Europe did suffer dissolution, and war came, because one Power with its allies felt strong enough to disturb the equilibrium which had prevailed more or less for a hundred years.

The recent war sprang from the ambitions of the Central Powers in Europe. But it at once spread beyond the bounds of a single continent. The British Dominions offered instant help, gratefully accepted. Japan destroyed German ambitions in the Far East. The struggle as it developed drew in one State after another, until with the entrance of the United States into the war a new alignment was complete. The primacy of the great States in Europe, which had broken down owing to dissensions among themselves, and the old Balance of Power, which had been challenged by German self-confidence, gave place to a new system, made up of the Allied and Associated Powers on the one hand and the Central Powers on the other. With the defeat of our enemies, the supremacy of the Allied and Associated Powers within the system was established beyond challenge.

But already a new grouping seems to be at hand. The five principal victorious Powers have, in the composition of the Council of the League, in the preambles of the Treaties of Peace, and in many substantive parts of them, secured formal recognition of their ascendancy. However there are signs that the United States would not sit comfortably on a permanent Council representing for the most part non-American Powers, and is anxious to return to her position of pre-eminence on the American continent and disentanglement from the affairs of Europe. Of the States reputed great in Europe before the war, Austria, Germany, and Russia are in eclipse. The disappearance of the Austro-Hungarian Empire was long overdue; but Germany and Russia may pass out of the shadow, and their ultimate readmission to the deliberations of the leading Powers

is assumed in many quarters. Perhaps we are moving even now to a time when a new Balance of Power and a new Concert will be established in Europe, not unlike the Concert of the nineteenth century, but acting, no longer informally, but through the formal agency of the Council and Secretariat of the League.

Though the old diplomatic principle, in deference to public opinion of the hour, has received little open recognition since the war, evidences of its working are everywhere apparent. For instance, after the armistices and before terms of peace were presented to Germany and Austria, there was a strong movement in Central Europe for union between all the German-speaking peoples. Such a proposal was regarded with great disfavour in Allied capitals, and the Treaties provide that the independence of Austria shall be inalienable without the consent of the Council of the League. The ground of objection doubtless was fear lest such an accession of potential strength to Germany might permanently disturb the Balance of Power. Again, according to information from continental sources, Article 13 of the Treaty of London, which preceded the entry of Italy into the war, provided that 'Should France and Great 'Britain augment their African colonial dominions at the ex-'pense of Germany, these two Powers recognise in principle that 'Italy will be entitled to claim some equitable compensations' (*Times*, 6th January 1920). It may reasonably be assumed that the principle of compensation, which is a corollary of the doctrine of the Balance of Power, will under the new order continue to be applied to territorial changes in Africa, and will be extended to the settlement of the Middle East. Admittedly, these transactions belong to a period before the Council of the League can take up its duties; but the principle of equilibrium is not on that account reduced to mere transitory importance. If in the Council, now established, unfortunate differences should arise, the distribution of political power among its members, a factor which even in their unanimity receives tacit acknowledgment, would in their dissension openly resume its old importance.

Those international jurists who regard some such principle, not at all as a distasteful necessity, but as essential to the progress of the law of nations, cannot share the existing prejudice against it. The popular feeling, though natural enough,

has the effect of transferring responsibility for the war from the evil spirit of powerful classes in Central Europe, where it properly belongs, to an inanimate instrument which is in itself capable of both good and harm, according to the character of those who control it.

'It is a fact—I make this statement although I am sure that it will be violently contradicted—that, just as hitherto, so within a League of Nations, some kind of Balance of Power only can guarantee the independence and equality of the smaller States. For the Community of Power, on which the League of Nations must rest, would at once disappear if one or two members of the League became so powerful that they could disregard the combined power of the other members.'

In this emphatic language Oppenheim spoke of the Balance of Power in the first of the lectures which comprise his last book.

The form in which the Covenant of the League is drawn is apt to conceal the resemblance between the new régime and the old. It also hides the fundamental points of difference between the League and other associations known to national systems of law which possess constitutions similar in appearance. The Council and the Assembly with their respective functions, the provisions as to voting and general meetings, the agenda and the reports, do no doubt irresistibly suggest an analogy to a company with its board of directors and its memorandum and articles of association, or to a club with its committee and its rules. But behind the company and the club stand the statutes and the common law, and to them the whole institution makes submission; behind the Covenant there is no law that will inevitably be enforced, but only the old law of nations with its imperfect sanction. There is much ground for hope in the League, and every international lawyer, whatever his misgiving, must wish it well. It is the world's confession, extorted by suffering, that war is not the better way. It supplies a field for all who are labouring in the cause of international co-operation. Periodical meetings of statesmen from many nations, permanent administrative and judicial machinery, and the practice and study of international law must tend to curtail national animosities and misunderstandings. Such things should foster that spirit in international relations which alone can promise a better world. But precisely at the point where it diverges from all national institutions of a similar character the League reveals that weak-

ness characteristic of the law of nations which is the main obstacle to future progress.

A contract under any legal system—and the Covenant of the League is a contract—relies for its enforcement in the last resort upon external power. Assuredly, for every man in a modern State who breaks his agreement a dozen carry out their obligations without a thought; but such a law-abiding sentiment cannot be created or effectively sustained where laws are not enforced by physical power if need arise. The instrument however which secures obedience to the laws is not their ultimate sanction; that instrument itself came into being, and is upheld, by the will of the community subject to those laws. 'The institutions of political society—those by which equal rights are 'guaranteed to members of such a society—are an expression of, 'and are maintained by, a general will.' *

Now the members of a modern State by their votes, or at least by their acquiescence, delegate the administration and enforcement of law to special officers; and these officers are armed by the State with power to carry out their duties at all times without favour and without fear. But the Family of Nations has made no delegation of this kind; and international law is in practice enforced, either by the actual or threatened intervention of third States in a particular dispute, or by the aggrieved State on its own behalf. Such means of enforcement, which are less efficacious than those available in an organised State, have long been in existence to support the law of nations; and they have not always proved adequate to their task. It is natural, therefore, to turn eagerly to the Covenant of the League, to discover what contribution it makes towards strengthening their effectiveness.

Art. 16: 'Should any member of the League resort to war in disregard of its Covenants . . . it shall *ipso facto* be deemed to have committed an act of war against all other members of the League, which hereby undertake immediately to subject it to the severance of all trade or financial relations, the prohibition of all intercourse between their nationals and the nationals of the covenant-breaking State, and the prevention of all financial, commercial, or personal intercourse between the nationals of the covenant-breaking State and the nationals of any other State, whether a member of the League or not.'

* Green, 'Lectures on the Principles of Political Obligation.'

In addition to this general boycott, the penalty clause provides that the Council is to recommend to the several Governments concerned what armed force they should contribute to protect the Covenants of the League, and that the members should mutually support one another against the offending State, which may, under certain conditions, be expelled from the League. These penalties do not differ in kind from those already in use. It is true that, under this article, the members no longer have merely the general right bestowed by International Law to intervene in its support, but an express duty to take certain measures on its behalf. Moreover with an organised Council to recommend and supervise plans for armed intervention and mutual assistance, the Great Powers may become more effective in action than was the old informal Concert. But the value of these changes depends upon the spirit in which they are applied, and it cannot yet be determined how far they will be able to remedy the disability of the law of nations which lies in the weakness of its sanction.

Many who have doubted the power of such partial measures to remedy this disability have urged the immediate establishment of a system of international government with an executive, legislative, and judicial branch; but such a proposal must be inspired by a misunderstanding of the history of legal development. The Family of Nations and its law must be compared, not with a modern State and its legal system, but with the institutions of a less advanced community. 'Whenever a ques-'tion of law arises in a primitive community,' wrote Oppenheim in his general treatise on International Law, 'it is the community 'itself and not a court which decides it.' It is only at a later period that the general body of the people finds itself unable to exercise judicial functions on its own behalf, and the disadvantages of leaving the growth of law entirely to the operation of case on case become understood and appreciated. But the law of nations is still in an early stage of development, and the community of States is only now acquiring for the first time a form of political organisation. To impose upon it a constitution adapted only for societies of a maturer type would be to invite disaster and the overthrow of all that has been accomplished. Communities, their laws, and the sanction of their laws, grow

and develop concurrently; they depend one upon the other, and all rest upon a common basis of consent.

The successive steps leading to that consent almost defy analysis, so interwoven are the influences of language, geography and race, force and fear, habit, tradition, education and temperament, and the stress of a thousand accidental circumstances. But whatever its origin, consent is the basis of the institutions of government. If the members of the Family of Nations were to give real and abiding consent to the adoption of an international constitution, there would be no great difficulty in framing it; but such consent, if it is to come at all, must develop by slow degrees in accordance with historical laws. Without it no constitution could stand.

Moreover in order to secure stability for an international constitution, or for any system of international relations based upon the rule of law, that kind of consent must be evolved which springs from conviction and is in its nature real and abiding. Such consent as a father might have to give to the marriage of his daughter with a profligate is not of this kind. Nor is consent extorted from nations in the depth of ruin or overcome by weariness of war. Nor indeed, speaking generally, is consent given to secure a compromise, unless the proposed terms are so framed that they follow the trend of natural development and do real violence to the convictions of only a few men. The great experiments in codification which marked the history of International Law in the generation before the war illustrate the importance of these distinctions. The Hague Conventions and the Declaration of London were designed to promote peace, not only by providing machinery for arbitration, but by eliminating doubts and divergent practices in the law of nations. They were also intended to mitigate the cruelty of war, if war was inevitable, by applying to it the general standard of humanity accepted by the age. But their success on these errands fell far short of expectation, and the cause of their failure lay, partly in the kind of consent which they obtained, and partly in the nature of the rules which they embodied.

The later Victorian period and the early years of the twentieth century witnessed an unusual number of international agreements, political, legal, industrial, and scientific. They were a characteristic expression of the times. In each of the wars since

1815 only a few States had taken part. The public law of Europe had secured formal recognition and added prestige. Some had dared to hope that through the progress of the law-making treaty war might one day be brought to an end. Lawrence, for instance, writing in 1910, voiced a belief that the period through which the world was then passing might end in the establishment of an organised international society. 'Were 'this once done, war would in time become as abnormal and 'infrequent as rebellion.' *

But under cover of these constant assertions of goodwill, the nations of Europe were taking up their positions for the impending conflict, and many of their citizens had from the outset distrusted the rapid multiplication of the conventions. As the threat of war became clearer large numbers lost faith in them, and saw the dangers to which sailors and soldiers pointed. But others clung to them the more, seeing in them the only possible refuge from a great catastrophe. Such an atmosphere was not healthy for the growth of a real and abiding consent.

Another defect in these twentieth century conventions lay in the manner in which their provisions attained their final form. While customary law grows in response to an immediate need, and is taught in the school of experience, treaty-made law too often represents a compromise which has no true friend, and pays little regard to actual needs, or to the means available for putting it into force. In framing rules of war and neutrality the naval and military experts had small experience of modern conditions to guide them. The great industrial changes of the nineteenth century, the practical application of scientific discoveries, world commerce, world finance—these things stood between them and the last war of the nations. Even such rules as the experts felt able to recommend had still to undergo change upon change at the hands of laymen for the sake of compromise. Perhaps the delegates grew weary of their work, and lacked inclination to bend their efforts towards finding better means of putting their new codes into force; perhaps they knew that in the temper of the world in those days no better means were anywhere to be found.

* Preface to the fourth edition of his 'Principles of International Law,' p. v.

If, as is probable, new attempts are made in the future to codify parts of the law of nations, their success will depend above all upon the existence of new means of enforcement, more regular in action. Indeed this would of itself abolish many uncertainties. 'No set of rules,' wrote Westlake, 'national or 'international, will ever be reduced to a reasonable certainty 'unless they are regularly applied or some authoritative judgment 'is passed on the question of their application.' But for successful codification more is required than an improved sanction. The proper foundation of a code is experience in the administration of the law, and much of its utility depends on the means available for amending it. Unless such considerations are taken into account, future codes of International Law may share the epitaph set above the Declaration of London by the British and French Governments in their joint memorandum to neutrals of July 1916: 'The rules could not stand the strain imposed by 'the test of rapidly changing conditions and tendencies which 'could not have been foreseen.'

But whether or not a new movement arises for the codification of International Law, future progress seems to depend, not upon the substitution of some new diplomatic principle for the Balance of Power, nor upon the adoption by the Family of States of a modern type of constitution, nor upon the embodiment of the law of nations in a code, but upon the strengthening of its sanction, so that it may be more effectively applied. This is the chief problem which awaits solution, and it is one of great complexity. Legal principles cannot solve it unaided; statecraft cannot solve it unaided; though legal principles and statesmanship may contribute valuable aid. For as Lawrence truly declared in one of his latest lectures which make up the volume, 'The Society of Nations': 'The problem before us is at 'bottom moral and spiritual; there is no real security for a 'better and nobler international society save the ennoblement 'of the thoughts and desires of men.' In other words the difficulty does not lie in devising means for enforcing the law of nations, but in obtaining general consent for their employment.

Before such consent can be secured, moral reform must counteract the instinctive tendency of States to resort to violence, and grapple with any anti-social bias in the national

temperament. Diplomacy must establish a tradition of foreign policy which respects the law. Political leaders must accustom their followers to the punctual execution of international duties sometimes unpleasant. The limited power which now stands by consent behind the rules of the law of nations must be wielded wisely and justly, so as to inspire reverence as well as fear, and win from the community their approval for more regular and extended employment. Above all, means must be found to thwart the disruptive influences of language, geography, and race, and to break down national antipathies which stand in the way of progress.

Geographical barriers — mountains, rivers, and seas—by hindering intercourse, and by affecting climate and soil, have given rise to racial peculiarities and divergencies of type which lie at the root of the problem of nationality. Nationality is a complex thing. Common language, common racial descent, and a common religion generally play a part in its development. But the barrier of language may be broken down by education and travel; races may be blended by migration and intermarriage; the prevailing religion may relax its hold, yielding place to some new religious or industrial creed which cuts across national divisions. Yet the antagonism of nationalities and their conflicting ambitions may remain as strong as ever.

The problem of nationality has grown rapidly during the past hundred years. At the Congress of Vienna it neither received nor demanded recognition. The French Revolution, although it set men thinking far beyond the frontiers of France, had provoked no popular outbreak in other European States. But by the year 1848 'all was restlessness, all eager expectation of 'the dawning epoch of national life.'* The movements for national independence in Germany, Italy, and Austria—the efforts to make the State one with the nation—excited wider interests than the movement for constitutional liberty, and dominated European history for many years. It is interesting to speculate whether the movement of nationalities will advance until every nation possessing strong national consciousness has attained independence, or whether it will be finally stayed by considerations of commercial or strategic necessity. The

* Fyffe, *op. cit.* Vol. iii., p. 2.

answer would seem to depend in part upon the success achieved by the League in protecting small States.

But whatever be the future career of the principle of nationality, in its present phase it seems able to make headway against all the factors tending towards international unity.

It was commonly asserted right down to the outbreak of war in 1914 that the powerful influences of international trade and finance would turn the scale against future wars. Certainly the trader who has bought a stake in the industrial welfare of a foreign country must reflect upon the cost of war between that country and his own; inevitably an investor who has capital in several foreign States will strive to promote harmony between them. Beyond question the delicate machinery of finance and the exchange will be clogged and broken by hostilities. But hopes of peace founded on such considerations have been disappointed. The ambitions of competing traders in outlying provinces foment national rivalries. Monied interests may seem to see profits in the dangerous game of world politics. When passions are aroused, calculations of material prosperity fall into disdain. Intellect surrenders to the heart, and in the heart is enthroned the sentiment of nationality.

Nationality, and all the emotional forces which it commands, are set against the extension of the domain of law. Every argument of reason supports the rule of law and the pursuit of international harmony; but in a conflict with sentiment, reason prevails, if at all, only after a hard struggle. To-day the project of a united and law-abiding community which has been formulated in the Covenant of the League is borne along by the emotional tide of hatred against war. But this tide will ebb. Honest doubts will question the theory that the first experiment in world organisation can all at once end war, and painful experience may confirm them. In the future therefore the progress of the law of nations cannot be rapid.

Such reflections do not quell the enthusiasm of an international lawyer. 'In times when wars have been both long and 'bitter, in moments of revolutionary passion, on occasions when 'temptation and opportunity of selfishness on the part of 'neutrals have been great, men have fallen back into disregard 'of law and even into true lawlessness.' These are the words of

the eminent jurist W. E. Hall, who, fifteen years before it began, foresaw with astonishing penetration the course of the recent war. Problems, he thought, which had accumulated during the past half century would all receive their answers at once. Some hates would crave for satisfaction, and much envy and greed would be at work. Above all there would be the hard sense of necessity. Whole nations would be in the field ; the commerce of the world might be on the sea to win or lose. Conduct in the next war would certainly be hard ; whether it would be scrupulous was more than doubtful. But reflections such as these did not disquiet him, because, looking back over two hundred years of history, he saw how the law of nations had progressively taken a firmer hold and extended the area of its activities. It had risen above trivial formalities to grapple with the fundamental relations of States. The advance, however many rebuffs it had sustained, had been very considerable.

In the light of experience, national antipathies must be regarded as an obstacle formidable enough, but not necessarily insurmountable, since law, organisation, and nationality can be reconciled. The omnipotence of law in a civilised community does not prevent proper competition between citizen and citizen. Loyalty to the State has not been found to stifle local patriotism in professions or in schools ; but it is recognised that wholesome rivalry should stop short before the smashing of hats and helmets. The reconciliation of State and individual, of law and freedom now seem so natural ; yet the conflict was once acute. One day perhaps the reconciliation between world organisation and national aspirations will seem as easy. But at the present time diplomacy in some irresponsible capitals shows the fresh vigour of the school-boy rather than the political wisdom of grown men. Even in States more conscious of their responsibilities, the prevailing conception of foreign policy is less advanced than the general social outlook, and citizens are found to demand for their country what they would be ashamed to ask from their neighbours even for a son or daughter. The standard of international morality is still comparatively low, and its progress since the end of the fighting has been less marked than many had hoped. A spectator of the ceremony in the Galerie des Glaces wrote in the *Times New Year Supplement* that ' The surroundings recalled the alternate humiliations in-

'flicted on one another by France and Germany rather than the 'dawn of a new era of reconciliation.'

Those who were not present can only hope—they cannot assert—that such reflections were unjust; for that was the day and place of the launching of the Covenant of the League. In the present state of international feeling nations must put their trust in strong frontiers, defensive alliances, and readiness for war. Foolhardy would be those who did otherwise. But such measures, while they may secure victory, cannot secure permanent peace, which will come only through the healing of national animosities.

Spokesmen of the League of Nations often seek to reinforce their argument by dwelling upon the progressive horror of science applied to war. Their contention is true enough, not perhaps because new weapons of offence must be terrible beyond all precedent (for the means of defence may keep pace with the development of methods of attack), but because the scientific organisation of a modern State enables it more and more to prolong a struggle beyond the limit of endurance as understood in former times. Just as the oarsman learns by intensive training to row out all his faculties to the point of exhaustion, nations are learning to organise so as to throw every resource into the struggle. But the appeal to fear, however well it may be justified, is likely to be ignored when the moment of crisis comes. How many thousands of those who hurried off to the war had shuddered in their school-days at the terrible pictures of scientific battles drawn for them by Mr. Wells.

Neither national animosities nor the spirit of war can be fought down by enlisting support from the emotions; for over fear and repulsion, courage and patriotism will in the long run rightly prevail. The true and abiding ally of international peace is the intellect, and substantial victories might be won by education. But at present education, and in particular school histories, often aggravate the difficulties instead of attempting to solve them. The germs of Prussianism were implanted at school. The story of the rupture between England and America, as told in many books in common use, stands in the way of a better understanding with the United States. School history books should certainly record deeds of glory and patriotism, and teach lessons of heroism, self-sacrifice, and devotion. But they should

also teach the virtues of restraint, humanity, tolerance, and peace. 'Never derogating for an instant or by an inch from the honour 'and interests of his own country, he has striven, as few men 'have striven, to maintain and preserve the greatest interest of 'all countries—universal peace.' This is the noblest judgment that history could pass upon man's work. Let the statesmen of all nations learn it at school. War presses heavily upon the peoples, victorious as well as vanquished. Violations of International Law bring their own punishment in the fullness of time. There are deep truths in the preamble of the Covenant—dull texts perhaps for children, but bearing all hope for the future.

In the work of education the teaching of International Law should play a part. It is of course a law of many uncertainties, and its sanction is comparatively weak; but it is inspired by a great purpose. 'Our cause is that of humanity.' Yet the law of nations is without prestige both in Parliament and in the public services, and pupils are deterred by the lack of opportunity. Six trite phrases and the names of Grotius and Wheaton are full equipment for every career, and why should a man learn more? Yet 'the understandings of international law' can hardly become 'the actual rule of conduct among Governments' unless those who conduct foreign policy, and those who control it, are themselves familiar with them.

But national sentiment, however much modified by education, will not come to terms with a system which the world still distrusts. Only by performing successfully the lesser functions assigned to it—a task which it has hitherto failed to accomplish —can the law of nations justify its claim to fuller confidence. It cannot ask to be trusted with the safe keeping of national interests until it has proved its capacity in humbler spheres. Article 14 of the Covenant directs the Council to formulate plans for a Permanent Court of International Justice, and the Treaties of Peace refer many matters for its decision. In carrying out their task, members of the Council may well study an English experiment of considerable interest. When a wages arbitration court, established for war purposes, brought its work to a close shortly before the passing of the Industrial Courts Act, speeches of undoubted sincerity were made at the final sitting by representatives both of employers and workers, praising the discretion and impartiality of the tribunal. But the secret of its success

lay, not in the magic of its methods, but in the personality of its members. Likewise for the proposed international court the first condition of success lies in a wise choice of its judges. The second lies in limiting the burden of responsibility cast upon it in its earlier days. If the members of the Court could avoid for the time the perilous attractions of disputes involving national honour and safety, and if their judgments won renown for fairness and wisdom, then it might be possible in years to come to extend the jurisdiction of the Court, with the consent of all nations, in a manner which would now meet with almost universal opposition.

If then the task of the future is to curb national rivalries, to dispel distrust in the power of International Law, and to win from the peoples real and abiding consent to new and more regular means of enforcement, progress must be slow. If the most promising methods of advance are the dissemination of a new spirit by education and training, and humble and difficult experiments in the administration of international justice, many obstacles are to be surmounted. Small beginnings, with a prospect of many reverses, offer a gloomy alternative to the dreams of world government which have beset the thinkers of all ages, and scant satisfaction for the cravings for peace and contentment in hungry Europe. But in the history of the law of nations rules which have developed slowly have proved to be more enduring, and stern warnings abound for those who foretell an easy triumph. 'Our generation'—so Oppenheim concluded his last book on the science to which he had devoted his later life—'Our generation can only do its best for the future, and it 'must be left to future generations to perpetuate the work 'initiated by us.'

RONALD F. ROXBURGH.

ENGLAND AND AMERICA

IN the October issue of this REVIEW I explained some of the causes that have kept England and America apart and why the war, instead of having brought the peoples of the two countries closer, has driven them further asunder. The purpose of this article is to show what may be done, on our side at least, to bring about a sympathetic understanding and so to secure a friendship that will be of advantage not only to both countries but to the whole world; for the peace and contentment of the world rest to a very large extent upon the joint action of the two English-speaking nations. They must work hand in hand, trusting each other completely, each permitting no petty jealousies or sordid rivalries to raise suspicion as to the motives of the other; striving together to accomplish their common duty.

In attempting to bring about this spiritual alliance which he holds essential, the present writer finds himself the critic of his own Government. In all international affairs criticism of one's own Government is an ungracious task, yet in this case it is necessary, and it may justifiably come from an Englishman whose long residence in America gives him the advantage of detachment, but who is not so detached that he has ceased to be an Englishman. Having been in a position to see British blunders, and having through intimate association with Americans known the effect those blunders have produced, I think that I may reasonably claim the right to criticise, and with diffidence to offer suggestions.

Until a date so recent that historically it is only yesterday the British Foreign Office did not regard America as a problem that would repay the time and effort spent in study. It is true that Ministers were appointed to Washington, and in the course of time the Legation was raised to an Embassy, and America received the Foreign Office imprimatur of a 'first class' Power; but the form did not change the spirit. Without in any way disparaging the ability or devotion of men who served their country with fidelity and intelligence, it may safely be said that

few of the envoys who in the past have represented England at Washington really understood America. In the nature of things it was impossible. The country is so vast, its systems of Government so complex, the psychology of its people, their habits of thought, political ideas, and social customs so unlike those of any other country, that a diplomatist trained in Europe or experienced in the Far East must find his accumulated knowledge of little value when transplanted to this new field. He is confronted with a problem requiring long and hard study to master, and he is afforded neither the time nor the opportunity to study it. He gets to know the 'Government,' that is the comparatively few persons with whom he is brought in official or social relationship through his official position. They treat him with the courtesy and deference which Americans hold to be due to a distinguished guest, and consequently avoid telling him the truth with unpleasant bluntness. But of the country as a whole and of the people at large he knows nothing. The British Minister sits in Washington for nine months every year, and for the remaining three months goes to a fashionable watering place, when he does not go home for his holiday. Of the great cities of the Middle West and the Pacific Coast, of the long Atlantic seaboard and of the States that border on the Caribbean Sea, he knows nothing. Almost of necessity in the past the British Ambassador to the United States has looked upon Washington merely as a station on the road to preferment. The big prizes were in Europe ; Washington was only of minor importance in international politics, and it was more profitable to study the intrigues of some petty court or the mentality of some minute European people than to become an American specialist. Few diplomats remained long enough in America to master their subject, though occasionally the rare man did.

Nor could the Ambassador in the not very remote past hope for much assistance from his subordinates. Secretaries and *attachés* are birds of passage; they flit even more quickly than ambassadors. The Foreign Office has a perverted tradition that knowledge gained by practical experience leads its possessor to the untimely grave of 'rut.' Consequently no man until he attains ministerial rank, except in very rare instances, remains in one post more than three years, and frequently he is transferred after a year or two. The

result is that many of the younger men, some of whom will be ministers or ambassadors, have a superficial knowledge of many countries, but seldom if ever a profound knowledge of any one country. Let me again repudiate any desire to disparage the diplomatic service. I have known many of its members, and I have been impressed with their wide knowledge of the world; some of them have agreed with me that the system is defective that gives a man a surface knowledge but throws every obstacle in the way of his becoming a specialist. Diplomacy is the only profession that discourages specialisation; in every other profession, the law, medicine, science, the army or navy, specialisation is essential to success.

The British Embassy in Washington ought to have an American specialist attached to its staff; a secretary or counsellor who has served long enough in America to be an authority on America, who knows its history, its geography, its politics and its people, not superficially, but with the same wide and comprehensive knowledge derived from practice and experience that any other master of his profession has; and the Embassy will never be properly equipped until this is done. Would a battleship be sent into action with officers, any one of whom is qualified to navigate, but none of whom has more than a passing acquaintance with the intricate machinery, the life of the ship? The Embassy is an inverted pyramid. The Ambassador, nominally the capstone of the edifice, rests on an insecure foundation because of his reliance upon subordinates insufficiently equipped to act as his advisers. I think most ambassadors of recent years, had they indulged in the luxury of frank speech and cast aside diplomatic reticence, would have said they were playing a game in ignorance of the rules. Or as I once heard a President of the United States remark, when a delicate international situation arose, referring to a distinguished Ambassador: 'Blank knows 'no more what is going on in a certain country than I do, because 'we are both getting our information from the same sources; but 'I have the advantage of His Excellency in knowing the politics 'of my own country and how far I am justified in going, while 'he knows nothing about this country or its politics.' It was not an ill-natured observation, nor was it intended as a slur. It was a simple statement of fact. The Ambassador, a man of unquestioned ability, and for whom the President entertained

great respect, was a child so far as his knowledge of America and its politics were concerned. The President knew it, and there was a gulf between them that could not have been wider if they had spoken different languages and neither understood the tongue of the other.

This diplomatic system has been the cause of many of the blunders that have occurred in official Anglo-American relations; it has made us often do the wrong thing or do the right thing in the wrong way. The present recognition of the necessity for the establishment of closer relations with the United States proves that in the past those relations have been neither sufficiently close nor cordial.

Yet the system occasionally produces results, or, to speak more correctly, despite the system unexpectedly happy results occasionally occur. The war, the great test of diplomacy, showed that men can be superior to a system. At the outbreak of the war there was sent to Washington, as Commercial Adviser to the Embassy, Sir Richard Crawford. Until then the Foreign Office had paid so little attention to commerce that there had never been a commercial specialist in the Embassy of England's most important trade rival; the Foreign Office had been content with an occasional report on trade written by one of the junior secretaries. Sir Richard Crawford came from Constantinople, where he had made a great and well-deserved reputation as financial adviser to the Turkish Government. The post entrusted to him in Washington required the nicest tact, wide commercial knowledge, good humour, firmness, combined with readiness to make concession where desirable, and an understanding of human nature. These are rare qualities to combine in any one man. Sir Richard Crawford's position was made more difficult by the circumstances under which he had to act. He could not, as in most diplomatic negotiations, proceed on the principle of give and take, balancing advantages gained against concessions granted. He was often compelled to oppose the material interests of the United States without offering any compensation. The British blockade, however inefficient and timid at first, was yet a blow at neutral trade. The black lists, the bunkering restrictions, the prohibition of enemy trading, the system of export licenses and the control over raw materials originating in the British Empire, all interfered with and

hampered American trade, and were deeply resented by Americans and made much of from 1914 to 1917 by the Germans and their allies in the United States. No man had such magnificent opportunities to create friction between the British and American Governments, so impossible did it seem that British interests could be protected without giving violent offence to the American Government. Yet so attractive was the personality of the man, so great was the confidence reposed in his integrity, that while the Washington Government frequently disagreed with him and American business men protested against his decisions, he was able always to maintain not merely friendly but really cordial relations. When the United States came into the war it adopted without reserve the whole system devised by Crawford to throttle Germany; the soundness and justice of his methods were admitted; he was constantly consulted by the various agencies set up by the American Government, and his advice was listened to and accepted as freely by that Government as by his own Government. Yet this modest man, who was not even a name to the public on either side of the Atlantic, whose work was so extraordinary that the reader knowing nothing of it might think the bare statement of it to be extravagant panegyric, went unrewarded and unrecognised by his Government and died of overwork, a victim to his devotion to duty.

The opportunity brought forth another man, which shows that even a bad system need not necessarily be fatal if a man has in him the stuff to overcome destructive influences and is gifted with understanding, Mr. Colville Barclay, now British Minister in Stockholm, came to Washington as Counsellor of Embassy in 1913 and retained that position until June 1919. The outbreak of the war found him acting as *chargé d'affaires* in the absence of Sir Cecil Spring Rice, then on leave. Owing to the condition of Sir Cecil's health, which eventually necessitated his retirement from the service, and to the long interval that elapsed between his death and the appointment of Lord Reading as his successor, and also owing to Lord Reading's absence in England in connexion with the Peace Conference, Mr. Barclay, I believe, acted more often and for longer periods as the head of an Embassy than any other man in the corps. He was very much in the same position that Crawford was, and was on the diplomatic

side of the Embassy what Crawford was in the commercial department. We are apt to forget now that for a period which lasted for more than half of the whole length of the war England and America did not always see eye to eye, that their interests were often opposed, and that there was more than one anxious moment in Anglo-American relations. It was a time to test a man, to prove whether he was merely a formalist, or had the sympathy and understanding that should enable him to protect the interests committed to his care without antagonising a people who would not sanction any surrender of what they held to be their national rights or tolerate any overt act of unneutral preference. Barclay's success like Crawford's—and in many respects the two men were singularly alike—was in a large measure due to the belief men had in his integrity, his sincerity, and his honesty of purpose. Like Crawford he carried on his work at the risk of his health, with little recognition from the Government he represented; but happily he escaped Crawford's untimely end.

The appointment of an American specialist in the Washington Embassy should lead to the appointment of his 'opposite 'number' in the British Foreign Office. The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, even the greatest Secretary, cannot be expected to know with the familiarity of intimate association the whole world. Apart from questions of policy which are his own business, he must rely for precise information and guidance on his technical advisers, and these men must be technicians in the true sense of the word.

If the Foreign Office understood America as it should—and is it asking too much to insist on it having that understanding? —there would be a more judicious use made of publicity. Publicity suggests propaganda, and propaganda is an abhorred word in America because it is so closely associated with the criminal methods of Germany. But proselytising propaganda is the last thing I have in mind. We do not need to proselytise in America. What we do need is to publish accurate information, not through the slow process of official communications, which are given sepulchre in official archives, but through the instantaneous medium of the Press, which is the great source of public knowledge. Throughout the first two and a half years of the war, while America was neutral, we suffered from that idiosyn-

crasy of the official mind which thinks that when it has written a minute, and filed it away safe from the desecration of impious eyes, a threatening danger has been laid. One might cite many instances of this folly ; one is enough. Few things caused so much irritation in America as our censorship of and interference with the mails. Anyone knowing the American temperament could have anticipated this attitude. The American had had little or no previous experience of official espionage. He was accustomed to feel implicit faith in the post office. When a letter left his hands he expected it to remain unopened until it reached the person to whom it was addressed ; he deeply resented the reading of his correspondence by strangers, and he disputed the right of any foreign government to prevent the delivery of his letters. Yet the American is reasonable and fair, with a sense of justice fully developed, and had it been properly explained to him that his mail was censored or interfered with because Germany was adding still another to her long list of crimes by violating the International Postal Convention, his irritation would have been vented on Germany and not on England. But the explanation was not made until after the mischief had been done. There were official communications long and laboured, which in due course were published in the newspapers, but unfortunately the public does not read diplomatic correspondence. Diplomacy to be assimilated must be administered in tabloid form.

It is improbable that before this article appears in print there will be a solution of the Irish question. But whether a solution is discovered or the old grievance remains to embitter Anglo-American feeling, the Foreign Office must be held at least in a measure responsible for this bitterness because in the past it was ignorant of and until quite recently indifferent to the state of feeling in America. Perhaps the Foreign Office is only a victim of general governmental inefficiency ; but as it is the sole agency charged with the conduct of foreign relations, its sins of omission and commission must be laid at its own door until it is absolved by proof. The fatuous belief was cherished in Downing Street that at election time Tammany Hall let off some Irish fireworks, which like all fireworks burst with a loud noise and filled the air with much smoke and many brilliant hues and amused a gaping crowd, but that when the sound of the ex-

plosion was over and the smoke had cleared away no one gave a thought to the show. And so the symptoms were neglected, and every year the display of fireworks became greater and the explosions louder.

The Foreign Office—or is it the Government?—has now awakened to the fact that the fireworks have a meaning more vital than mere noise and smoke, and yet it cannot escape from the lethargy of its traditions. It is of course magnificent to go your way unperturbed by assault or attack ; it shows such splendid faith in the strength of your own position and such utter contempt for the weakness of your assailant ; but is it business? The Irish in America need no mentor in American politics. They know how to play the game, and they have the means and the organisation with which to play it. Backed by ample funds they are carrying on a propaganda that is greatly damaging England in America and making thousands of Americans believe that Ireland is oppressed by England, and that English legislation is deliberately designed to impoverish Ireland for the enrichment of England.

To give one example : The Irish propaganda bureau in the United States has recently circulated a statement broadcast that 'during the war the railways of Ireland passed into the control 'of the English Government. Train services became fewer and 'slower, and passenger fares were increased 50 per cent., to the 'detriment of the internal trade of the country.' From this statement the average American, not knowing the facts, would naturally infer that Government control of the railways, the reduction of the train service, and the 50 per cent. increase of fares were a wicked discrimination against Ireland. Only a very small minority of Americans can be expected to know that England suffered precisely the same inconveniences as Ireland, though to a greater extent, when the Government of the United Kingdom, as a war measure, took over the railways throughout Great Britain and Ireland, reduced the train service and advanced fares. By this world-old device of suggesting a falsehood by suppressing part of the truth American opinion is artfully inflamed against England.

Yet it would be an easy matter for the Foreign Office or the British Embassy to spike the guns of the Irish propaganda bureau by a simple statement of the whole truth. It is not done

presumably for the same reason that made us disdain telling Americans why we went to war or the things England and her sons were doing in the various theatres of the war. 'We have 'never done that sort of thing,' was the curt official reply to the unofficial suggestion that it was highly necessary properly to present our case to the American people. Because we had never done that sort of thing before was a sufficient reason to the official mind why we should not do it now; although to the lay mind it is fairly obvious that times have changed. A century ago people read little and newspapers were few; to-day everybody reads, and statesmen only gain an audience as the newspapers see fit to report them.

Whether our national modesty or official stupidity is to blame, the lamentable fact is that we kept silent when American public opinion was in a fluid state and we ought to have been vocal; and then, as always happens when ignorance discovers its folly, we rushed to the opposite extreme and indulged in a senseless and wasteful propaganda, as if reckless expenditure would make up for lost time. This is the blunder we made in dealing with the German campaign of lies throughout the States; we are making the same blunder to-day with regard to the equally malevolent and equally dishonest Irish campaign. When the mischief is complete a swarm of great lawyers or eminent professors or distinguished scientists, not one of whom knows America or has the slightest understanding of American psychology, will be turned loose across the Atlantic to tell the Americans how foolish they are to believe anything the Irish say. And then it will be too late.

What I am trying to make plain to the reader, what I have insisted upon for a great many years as a result of long familiarity with the subject, is that we have been content merely with *official* relations, while what we ought to do is to establish the personal relation. There must of course be the official relation, and for that we appoint ambassadors; but, in America, that counts least of all. In Europe it is different; there the governmental and political systems place in the hands of a few men the power not only to originate policies but to execute them, and the peoples of Europe, curious as it may sound, are much more indifferent to foreign policy than are the American people. One reason to explain this paradox—for it is a paradox that a people whose

boast it is that they are aloof from alliances or international politics should be more vigilant in watching the foreign policy of their Government than peoples whose whole history is written in terms of international affairs—is that in America the power of the Government in foreign politics is so narrowed, circumscribed and hedged in, that the Government is really without power unless it has received a direct mandate from the people to do the specific thing which it contemplates. In Europe the Sovereign or a Foreign Minister can make a secret treaty or enter into an engagement committing the nation, and as long as the negotiation is kept secret public opinion does not have to be considered. When the public is enlightened it is then frequently too late for the public to express its opinion. This system, which has both merits and defects, has to a certain extent atrophied public interest in foreign affairs; the average man, Englishman, Frenchman, Italian, looks upon or used to look upon foreign affairs as a subject too recondite to justify the presumption of criticism or even a pretence of clear understanding; he is satisfied to leave matters in the hands of the experts for the time being, trusting to their superior knowledge and wisdom, and content to go about his own little concerns, which mean more to him personally than a new Grand Alliance or a *coup* which flutters every Foreign Office in the world.

But the American Government cannot make a secret treaty; it cannot in fact make a treaty of any kind; it can only enter into a negotiation and must then secure the approval of the Senate before the negotiated convention comes into existence as a valid treaty. Consequently the American Government in its treaty negotiations must always consider the immediate effect the proposal will have on public opinion. The Senate may have a nominal Government majority, that is a majority that will in nearly everything stand behind the Government—the President in this connexion being the Government in the European sense —but it does not necessarily follow it will be a majority for a particular treaty; and the Senate will always have a minority hostile to the Government. That hostile minority will, nine times out of ten, make no difference between a treaty and domestic legislation; it will regard either from the standpoint of politics and use it as a political weapon. The result is that from the first moment a treaty is sent to the Senate the minority

will be partisans, the newspapers will display the same partisanship, and the readers of those newspapers will, as a rule, reflect their partisanship. The more important the treaty, the more contentious it will be, the more it will be discussed, the more the average man will have firm convictions for or against it. Hence while in England the working man or the shopkeeper seldom vehemently champions or denounces a treaty — and of the existence of most treaties he would know nothing—in America it becomes the topic on every man's lips, passion is inflamed, prejudice is appealed to, racial animosities are played upon, and the President may be accused of having betrayed the country or bartered away its liberties.

It may seem superfluous to urge the importance of the cultivation of the personal relation between the peoples of the two countries in view of the close contact that has been maintained during the last few years, the visits of distinguished persons, and the numerous societies and other associations that have been established to create this relation; but these merely touch the fringe. What we forget in England, if indeed we ever knew, is that America is a country of 110,000,000 people, and the bulk of those millions—percentages are immaterial—are not distinguished, they are not members of clubs or societies, they neither make speeches nor write books, they do not live in the large houses in great cities; when they travel they remain in their obscurity and do not come in contact, either abroad or at home, with statesmen or the brilliant world of society. They are the great plodding, inarticulate, dull mass; individually of only minor importance, but all powerful because of their mass. The 'distinguished' man—one refers of course to the man whose distinction comes from holding high political office and whose utterances or action in consequence carry weight—owes his distinction to the mass, who give or take away as it may please them. Denied the power of expression they retain the power of action, which they exercise freely. The American who has reached distinction, the President, Senator or Governor, knows this; he knows it is the mass and not the class that made him, and as easily as they made him they can break him. We in England know nothing of the American mass; we know only in a vague way that it exists, but we assume that the class represents America. It does not. That assertion does not need

to be qualified, even if it savours of an utterance *ex cathedra*. Go into any 'movie' theatre in America, whether it be New York or a village which is only a dot on the map, and you find a cross section of the mass; but the 'Diamond Horseshoe' of the Metropolitan Opera House in New York, one of the great sights of the world, with all its beauty and brilliance, and telling its own story of wealth and fashion and culture, is the exotic setting of a class. The patrons of the opera are counted by their hundreds; 20,000,000 men and women daily see life as the film presents it.

What I mean by establishing the personal relation is to do on our side with the same directness what our enemies have with such cunning and so ingeniously done on theirs. The Irish News Bureau has made many thousands of Americans believe that England has done a great wrong to Ireland. Questions of policy, shadowy and disputable historical claims, motives even, can be argued, and the argument is seldom if ever conclusive; but every man feels competent to render judgment on a flagrant act of injustice. The Irish News Bureau has been clever enough to grasp this elementary psychology. It has made Americans believe that England has wronged Ireland; it has made a great many Americans, quite unconsciously, sit as judge and jury and render a verdict; it has made them take a very lively interest in the 'wrongs' of Ireland, and given them a personal interest in the case of Ireland.

I take Ireland merely as an illustration. It is as good as any other, but many others could be used. If these clouds to a fairer future are to be swept away we must rely not on formal communications between governments and the reserved utterances of officials, always fearful lest they shall say too much or incautiously commit themselves, but on frank and open intercourse. In a word, let the two peoples regard themselves as friends who have no concealments, and who value that friendship so much that they are not too proud to explain whenever explanation is necessary.

A. Maurice Low.

SCIENCE AND FRUIT GROWING

Science and Fruit Growing. Being an account of the results obtained at the Woburn Experimental Fruit Farm since its foundation in 1894. By the DUKE OF BEDFORD and SPENCER PICKERING. Macmillan. 1919.

THE record of researches carried out by the Duke of Bedford and Mr. Spencer Pickering, which is now published under the title of 'Science and Fruit Growing,' appears at an opportune time. Twenty-five years ago, when the Woburn Experimental Fruit Farm was established, fruit growers generally were engaged either in trying to carry on their industry along old lines, or, as was the case with Kentish growers, in renovating their orchards and adapting their industry to modern conditions. It was therefore hardly to be expected that they would be in a position to pay much attention to the scientific side of fruit growing, nor indeed had they been accustomed to look to science for help. Furthermore, twenty-five years ago biological science was so deeply engaged in its own development, and so absorbed in perfecting the laboratory and laboratory methods, as to be oblivious of the scientific problems which the growing of fruit and other crops might present to it for solution. It is true, of course, that many noteworthy exceptions to this devotion to the laboratory may be mentioned, but so far as fruit is concerned the Duke of Bedford and Mr. Spencer Pickering were the only persons in this country who brought the laboratory to the orchard and the orchard to the laboratory.

Conditions have now changed, and prominent among the factors which have contributed to bring about the change are the publication and discussion of the results of the Woburn experiments. During the quarter of a century which has elapsed since the Woburn Station was established, biological and chemical science have increased in wisdom and stature. They can now teach much to the practical grower, and are also better equipped to learn from him and from his growing trees. The solution of the problems recorded will not only benefit the industry of fruit growing, but will widen yet further the range

of botanical science, for among the phenomena presented by growing plants are many undreamt of in laboratory philosophy.

In like manner, the commercial fruit grower has learnt that he must look to science for help. His orchards are beset with many enemies, and to repel their attacks he must learn to recognise them—or at all events their evil manifestations—and to circumvent or counter-attack them. Thus the time is auspicious for the permanent yoking together of science and practice; harnessed singly neither one nor the other can draw fruit growing out of those ruts of routine into which, like all the complex industries of cultivation, it cannot but tend to fall. This conjunction of science with practice will prove of no less benefit to biological science, for it also tends to sink into and to remain in ruts.

It is because science and practice are now better equipped for their several tasks that they are more able to help one another than was the case when the Duke of Bedford and Mr. Spencer Pickering set out as pioneers, determined to prove all things before holding fast to that which is generally accepted.

From time to time since 1897 the publications of the Woburn Experimental Fruit Farm have made their appearance as a series of Reports, of which the seventeenth is now in the press. Many of these Reports contain conclusions which challenge the correctness of contemporary practice, and needless to say the Woburn gospels were received by no means always gladly by growers or men of science. At all times to the stay-at-home the pioneer is perforce a ne'er-do-weel, for if he were not he also would stay at home, and all people find it more or less difficult to accept the hard saying, 'There is one truth, whether it please 'or whether it displease.'

To-day the increasing sympathy with science which the general body of fruit growers are showing, and their better understanding of both the value and the deliberate, tentative methods of science, make it certain that practical men as well as professional biologists will recognise in the work done at Woburn a great achievement. They will extend to the authors a grateful appreciation of their labours, and will apply to this record of that achievement and of those labours the detached and considered criticism which the authors themselves would most desire.

The present position of the fruit growing industry is in itself so interesting, and the prospects for its extension are so promising, that the authors of the Woburn experiments will not take it amiss if, before detailed reference is made to the more remarkable of their results and conclusions, the present occasion is used to review both position and book. It will moreover be convenient to follow the sapient Dogberry's advice to 'Write 'God first,' and reversing the order of the title, to speak first of the prospects of fruit farming and then of science in relation to that industry.

Whosoever undertakes to survey the present position and prospects of fruit growing in England and Wales will do well to bear in mind the late Lord Salisbury's aphorism about maps. For as politics should be studied on large maps, so the politics of home food production should be studied on the geological map. A scrutiny of that map shows a mosaic of many formations. Its patchwork brings to the mind the diversity of England; a country of diverse soils and plant climates, and of diverse customs, peoples, and characteristics. It is a land of infinite variety, rebellious to generalisations. A recognition of this variety and natural rebelliousness should give pause to those who assume over hastily that all that is required for the extension of home food production is exhortation; who point the finger of reprobation at those farmers whose orchard trees are heavy with moss and lichen, who urge the adoption of mass production of fruit as carried on in foreign countries, and who are apparently unaware that at the present time, and in certain districts of England, the growing of fruit has been brought to a higher pitch of perfection than in any other country whatsoever.

The great commercial fruit growing districts of England may be described roughly as the Kent, East Anglian, and the 'Worcestershire' regions. Southward and westward from Worcestershire lie the cider and perry orchards which extend through the west country, and cover some 100,000 acres in Herefordshire, Worcestershire, Gloucestershire, Somerset, and Devon. In the 'Kent' district may be included the plantations in Sussex and Essex, and also the Middlesex plum orchards—relics of the girdle of fruit and market gardens which at one time surrounded London.

The most important region of the East Anglian area is the Isle of Ely, of which Wisbech is the centre. The area extends over parts of Cambridge, Lincolnshire, and Norfolk, and includes a great acreage which in the coming years is destined to become devoted more and more to the production of fruit.

Needless to say, there are many important commercial orchards and fruit plantations in other parts of the country, some devoted to mixed fruit, and others, like those in the Southampton district and the Tamar valley, specialising in the growing of such fruit crops as strawberries. Other districts of England and Wales are similarly favoured by climate, and specialised fruit growing is likely to become an important part of their husbandry in the near future.

Each of the three great fruit areas—Kent, East Anglia, and the Worcestershire district—also tend towards specialisation. Kent stands first in the production of top-fruit, and particularly apples and cherries of high quality. The industry is one of long date, and the methods of cultivation practised by Kentish growers have had and are having a wide influence on fruit growing in the other districts. The magnitude of the fruit growing industry in Kent is indicated by the fact that some 55,000 acres, that is about one-fifth of the total area of arable land, are devoted to fruit. Kentish fruit growers have moreover paid close attention to such subjects as packing and grading, and although these practices were interrupted by the war and by the impossibility of adjusting control of prices to fruit of different qualities, they are likely to be renewed and extended so soon as normal conditions are restored. There is evidence also that districts such as Evesham and East Anglia are keenly alive to the importance of paying greater attention to the preparation of their fruit for market.

In the East Anglian district specialisation in fruit growing takes the form less of growing high grade top fruit, though apples of excellent quality are produced in the Isle of Ely and in Cambridgeshire, than in growing for the jam manufacturer; that is, producing soft fruit destined to be made into jam. It is estimated that about one-third of the total soft fruit crop of England and Wales is produced in Wisbech and other parts of East Anglia, where 12,000 acres are devoted to the growing of strawberries, raspberries, etc.

The Worcestershire district is justly famous for its market garden crops; its centre, Evesham, is pre-eminently the plum growing district of England, and, as in the case of East Anglia, much of the crop, particularly the Pershore plum, finds its way to the jam factory.

To attempt to predict the prospects which await an extension of fruit growing is by no means an easy task. The prognosticator must take into account the present acreage under fruit, the average yield from existing orchards and plantations, the volume of imports, existing and prospective consumption, and the possibility of export both of jam and of fruit. Moreover, since the nature of the prediction must be influenced by the fiscal policy likely to be adopted in this country, it will probably be safe to adopt the assumption that importation of foreign fruit will take place as freely as was the case before the war.

According to the Ministry of Agriculture returns the area under fruit in England and Wales in orchards and plantations exceeding one acre is, at the present time, rather less than 300,000 acres. The estimated acreages under the different kinds of fruit, based on returns for the years 1913 and 1919, are shown in the following table:—

ACREAGE UNDER FRUIT.

		1913.	1919.	Increase or Decrease.
Top Fruit.	Apples	160,357	147,401	− 12,956
	Pears	10,065	9,587	− 478
	Plums	17,456	16,505	− 951
	Cherries	11,357	8,855	− 2,502
	Mixed	44,374	50,030	+ 5,656
	Total top fruit	243,609	232,378	− 11,231
Soft Fruit.	Strawberries	21,672	13,250	− 8,422
	Raspberries	7,044	6,017	− 1,027
	Currants	26,846	21,045	− 5,801
	Mixed	21,295	18,406	− 2,889
	Total soft fruit	76,857	58,718	− 18,139
	Total fruits	320,466	291,096	− 29,370

The most striking fact which emerges from a scrutiny of the table of acreage is that the area under soft fruit underwent a decrease of some 18,000 acres during the period of the war. This decrease is to be attributed to several causes. First, to the withdrawal of labour from the cultivation of fruit; second, to the insistence, by county authorities, on the reduction of the soft fruit acreage, or their discouragement or prohibition of fresh planting; third, to the effect of controlled prices in discouraging the production of fruit grown for direct consumption. To these causes may be added, in the case of black currants, the widespread prevalence of diseases which have rendered the cultivation of this crop difficult or impossible in certain districts.

Another fact of interest disclosed in the table is the shrinkage of the acreage under apples. It is possible indeed that the decrease since 1913 exceeds the 12,000 acres shown in the table, and it is probably to be accounted for by the going out of cultivation of worn-out orchards in the West, and other parts of the country.

From the point of view of the prospective planter these figures are not discouraging. They indicate that there is considerable lee-way to be made up before the supplies of soft fruit can be made equal to those in 1913. In this connexion however it is to be borne in mind that such fruits as strawberries come into bearing in a relatively short period, and that therefore no long time will elapse before production once again becomes normal. In the case of black currants however it is to be feared that until the two serious diseases of this crop, known as Big Bud and Reversion, can be combated successfully the area may decrease rather than increase.

The establishment by the Ministry of Agriculture of Research Stations for fruit investigations, of which two already are in existence—one at Long Ashton near Bristol, the other at East Malling in Kent—and a third in prospect, gives reason to hope that in course of time remedies may be found for these and other maladies which affect fruit plantations. Similarly it may be hoped that research undertaken at these stations and elsewhere may result in the production and general cultivation of new varieties both of apples, and of such soft fruits as raspberries, of which certain of the standard varieties are becoming worn out.

Most hopeful of all however are the facts that the great bulk of the soft fruit grown in this country is used for jam, and that

the consumption of jam by the British public—both military and civilian—has increased enormously during the war. According to the returns, the consumption of jam in the United Kingdom rose from 126,000 tons in 1914 to 340,000 tons in 1918. Although it cannot be doubted that a large part of this increase was due to deficiency of supplies of other commodities—butter and margarine—it is nevertheless fairly safe to predict that the public's new found taste for jam will endure, and this for two reasons: first because the public has discovered the wholesomeness of jam, and this discovery is in accordance with the fact that jam is known to contain a certain amount of the vitamines of fresh fruit, which substances—Nature's preventive medicines—serve to protect the body from diseases of malnutrition, such as scurvy; and secondly, because it is certain that margarine has come to stay, with the result that in all probability the old nursery rule, which middle-aged men can remember, 'butter or 'jam, but not both' will be rescinded and replaced by a new rule, 'jam *and* margarine, or at all events jam.'

When it is remembered that, roughly speaking, a pound of jam should contain half a pound of fruit, it may be computed that to provide for the ration of jam available in 1918 about 170,000 tons of fruit were required. Of this fruit the major part is no doubt plum; but a not inconsiderable quantity consists of the soft fruits—strawberry, gooseberry, raspberry, and currants. It may therefore be concluded that there is room for an increase in the area under soft fruits. In confirmation of this view it may be mentioned that one of the chief jam firms has estimated its requirements for the next few years at 5,000 tons per annum of one kind of soft fruit only, namely raspberries; a quantity which corresponds to about three-quarters of the total English crop.

The prediction that the consumption of jam is likely to increase receives some support from the fact that the 340,000 tons consumed in 1918 did not provide much more than a ration of four ounces per week per head of population, and it is evident that there is ample room for a consumption greatly in excess of that amount. Neither should it be forgotten that in pre-war years the export of jam was not inconsiderable. In 1914 the value of jam exports was £387,892, and there would seem to be no reason why the jam manufacturers, whose resources are

large, and whose enterprise has been so amply demonstrated during the war, should not extend their export business.

Leaving out of account any increase in consumption of fruit or jam, it is evident that the area under apples could be increased by upwards of 10,000 acres without fear of over-production. There is reason also to believe that increased production will also beget increased consumption, and there is also the possibility of home production competing more successfully with imported apples for the home market. The importation of apples in 1913 was valued at £2,250,000, and amounted to 162,871 tons. It is difficult to estimate home production, but a rough computation would put the average at about 730,000 tons, that is, about four times the amount of imported apples. Although the wise grower would not wish to see the imported apple ousted altogether—for the reason that at certain seasons of the year, when the home grown apple is not available, the imported apple *e.g.*, that from Tasmania, keeps the market and the retail shop going, and thereby helps to provide supplies practically over the whole year—nevertheless there is good reason to hope that with more attention on the part of growers to marketing, packing, and grading, the English apple may succeed in extending the period during which it is able to frighten the imported apple off the home market.

Lastly it is to be borne in mind that costs of production of fruit in pre-war times were generally speaking no higher in this country than in the chief countries which export fruit to us ; from which it seems reasonable to infer that when conditions once more become stable, the cost of production of English fruit will not exceed that of imported fruit. The fact however has to be faced that there may be an intermediate period when production will prove to be more costly in this country than abroad ; but as a set off against this possibility are present high freights and tonnage shortage.

Whether home produce is able to capture more of the home market must also depend on improved methods of transport. It is held by many fruit growers that in certain districts methods of transport are unsatisfactory. Not all the railway companies serving fruit-growing districts provide suitable wagons for the carriage of perishable fruit, and throughout the country no sufficient means exist for bringing into consumption

in years of large production more than a part of such a crop as the plum crop. It is only by arrangements between growers and associations of growers, market men, transport authorities, and the jam makers, that seasons of plenty can be turned into seasons of such profit to the grower that he is able to bear the inevitable loss which occurs in years of scarcity.

It is probable that much can be done to secure a due and reasonable return to the grower in seasons of plenty by jam-making firms increasing their installations of pulping plant in this country. These firms have already worked out methods whereby fruit pulp may be stored without any large loss or deterioration, and in the interests of all concerned with the fruit industry, it is desirable that the methods should be applied to the preservation of surplus crops in years of plenty to eke out the supplies in the lean years which follow and eat up the profit of the fat years.

From this rapid and incomplete survey it may be concluded that the prospects which attend upon the increased plantation of fruit are promising. To ensure confirmation of that promise planting must be done skilfully, the land selected by experienced men, the advice and services of experts of the County Authorities responsible for horticultural education and of the Ministry of Agriculture must be used to the full, modern methods of planting and of controlling pests must be employed, transport must be improved, and growers must combine to put standard fruits on the market, so that the consumer may know that he can purchase a standard English-grown apple as good in appearance as a Newtown Pippin, and better in flavour. Research must come more closely to the aid of the grower, and must endeavour to discover practical methods for the control of the chief of the pests which afflict orchards and plantations, and to raise new varieties suitable for cultivation by the commercial grower. The County Authorities responsible for horticultural education can also assist, and are already assisting growers by establishing demonstration fruit plots, wherein the inexperienced among the small cultivators may receive object lessons in the methods of planting and in the cultivation of their plantations.

It is not easy to apply scientific knowledge to any branch of agriculture, but in the case of fruit growing the application is peculiarly difficult, and this for several reasons.

A fruit tree generally makes its connexion with the soil not directly but through the mediation of another plant—the stock on which it was worked. It is a dual organism. The scion, the part which bears leaves and fruit, depends for its supplies of water and soil nutrients upon the roots of the stock which bears it. It therefore follows that any study of the behaviour and peculiarities of grafted fruit trees cannot be limited to the fruit bearing part, but must also be extended to the stock; for the work of the stock in supplying water and nutrients may give less satisfactory results than would be attained if the fruit bearing part of the tree were able to do its own work of absorption. The scion may find itself limited in its growth by the imperfection of its union with the stock, or by the failure of the stock to keep up a sufficiency of supplies.

An example of the first kind of failure is provided by the commercial variety of pear, 'Jules Guyot.' When grown on the quince stock it is apt to become stunted and over fruitful. It is therefore customary to employ as an intermediary between the stock and the scion another variety such as 'Beurre d'Amanlis' or 'Fertility.' The intermediate variety is grafted on the quince and Jules Guyot later on is grafted on the intermediary, with the result that a well-grown and sufficiently fertile tree is produced.

Examples of limitation of supply of water and soil nutrients, owing to peculiarities of the root system of the stock, are provided by apple trees grown on the 'Paradise' stock. The so-called Paradise stock is relatively surface rooting, and varieties of apples grown upon it tend to be dwarfer and to come to maturity earlier than when grown on the crab or free stock, and it is customary for fruit growers to take advantage of this habit of growth when planting their orchards.

A fertile source of error in investigations of fruit trees lies in the fact that although a group of trees of a given variety may all have been worked on what purports to be a common stock—for example, apples on the Paradise stock—it by no means follows that the stocks on which they were worked are identical with respect to vigour or absorptive power of their several root systems.

The recent researches initiated by Captain Wellington at the East Malling Experimental Station in Kent, and carried to a

conclusion by Mr. Hatton, show that it is possible to pick out a series of types of Paradise stock differing markedly and constantly one from another with respect to root system, vigour, and other characters. As a result of this admirable and fundamental piece of work, it is now possible for the first time to standardise Paradise stocks, and by propagating from one or other of the types to secure stocks of a high degree of uniformity. Hence the experimenter is able both to eliminate the source of error due to the use of different kinds of stock and to choose for any kind of experiment those of uniform, known, and suitable character. If he wishes to bring his experiment to a conclusion in a relatively short time he may use an extremely dwarfing form of stock which so checks the growth and hastens the development of his trees that even vigorous varieties of apple become mature when only one or two feet high, come into bearing within three or four years, and die of old age soon after. Similarly the gardener, according to the space at his command, may use as a stock for his apples one of severely or moderately dwarfing character yet possessed of a fair amount of fibrous roots borne near the surface of the ground, and the commercial grower may select for his bush, half-standard or standard tree-stocks of the right degree of vigour and strength for his particular purpose.

The variability of the free or crab stock is certainly no less and probably greater than that of the Paradise stock, and hence in the case of experiments with apples grafted on them the uniformity of result will tend to be obscured by the variability in the constitution of the subjects used for the experiment. The advance in knowledge which has been effected by the inquiry into stocks at the East Malling Experimental Station is of great importance to commercial growers from yet another point of view. The knowledge that a stock can be obtained of definite character with respect to its root system, vigour, and other qualities, will enable the fruit grower in the future to judge more accurately than has been possible in the past, at what distance apart he should plant his trees. There is little doubt but that in the past planting in commercial orchards has often been too close, and the grower will be well advised when planting an orchard to be more liberal in the allowance of space which he gives his trees.

Growers are gradually coming to the view that bush trees

should be planted, not 10 or 12 feet but 18 feet apart, half-standards 24 or even 30 feet, and standards not less than 30 feet apart. By planting at these distances the grower may be confident that even when his trees have reached maturity they will not be found to interfere with one another, but will leave a sufficient space for the full cropping of the trees as well as for the permanent interplanting of the orchard with bush fruit or its intercropping with vegetables. Until however the new stocks are in common use the source of error due to the variability of stocks will remain to vex the mind of the experimenter.

Another difficulty which is encountered in investigations in problems of fruit growing lies in the fact that our major fruits are borne on trees, and that knowledge of the physiology and genetics of trees is at present far from complete. The behaviour of the tree is influenced not only by present conditions but also by conditions which obtained during the past year or years. The crop borne last year has to be taken into account among the factors which determine this year's crop. The effects of manuring or other special treatment may last for many seasons, or conversely may not be revealed until after the lapse of a long period.

With these considerations in mind the records of the Woburn experiments may now be considered in some detail, and it may be said at once that they exhibit a brilliant vindication of the experimental method, and a triumph over experimental difficulties.

The observations recorded by our two authors as to the times of flowering of varieties of apples serve to illustrate the imperfect state of our knowledge with respect to the physiology of fruit trees. The character which determines 'time of flowering' has been shown in the case of certain annual horticultural plants to obey the rules of Mendelian inheritance, and seedsmen have long ago raised and distributed races of garden plants, such as peas, which exhibit remarkable constancy and uniformity of time of flowering. Sown the same day, and grown under normal conditions, all the plants of a given race of early, mid season, or late peas come into blossom at the same time. The Woburn observations however show that the members of a given variety of fruit tree exhibit a fairly wide range of

variation in their flowering time, and since there can be little doubt but that in fruit trees—no less than in other plants—time of flowering is an inherited character, it is to be concluded that the variation must be ascribed to the fact that the relations between a tree and its environment are more complex than is the case with an annual plant. The tree 'looks before and 'after,' and its present behaviour is determined not only by present conditions of soil and climate, but also by the conditions which obtained in the previous year, and by its own behaviour in previous seasons.

The value of researches however lies not only in what they prove, but in what they bring within the region of proof, and here, as in all the pages of this book, the student has his attention directed to new and promising opportunities for research. Thus the authors mention (p. 144) the French variety of apple, 'Grosse St. Clement,' which blossoms exceptionally late, and it is evident that those interested in the breeding of new varieties might benefit future generations of growers in districts susceptible to spring frosts by using such a specially late variety for the formation of a new race of late flowering apples. The work which has been done in the United States in introducing Russian apples, and discovering varieties suitable for growing on prairie land and capable of resisting severe frosts, provides an illustration of what is possible of accomplishment by breeding with specific objects in view.

Another subject dealt with in the Woburn Reports is the interesting phenomenon exhibited by certain varieties of apples in bearing fruit only in alternate years. That this 'biennial' habit is deeply ingrained in certain varieties is well known. In some cases fat and lean years alternate regularly, a good crop being followed and preceded by a poor one, or no crop at all.

To those who are aware of the extraordinary manifestations of rhythmic activity displayed by plants the phenomenon of 'biennialness' of fruiting will not be surprising, although a physical explanation of the phenomenon must remain for the present beyond their grasp. Among the factors which must be taken into account in arriving at an explanation of the biennialness of bearing of certain fruit trees are :—

(1) The general capacity of plants and animals to conduct their lives rhythmically. To give but one instance: a worm

(*Convoluta roscoffensis*),* living in colonies on the seashore, and within tide marks, learns to burrow in the sand just before the tide comes over its station, and to emerge soon after the tide has receded from that station.

(2) A rhythm induced by the recurrence of alternating conditions may remain as an after effect even though the conditions become uniform. Thus, if the worms are scooped up with a little sand and sea water into a saucer, and are brought into a room, they continue their up and down tidal movement for about a week, and even though they be kept in darkness they yet practise the habit for some days.

When it is remembered that a tree lives not only in the present but in the future, in that it is doing work this year which will only bear fruit in the next, and therefore that its power of doing things this year is derived from dispositions made in a previous year, it is not surprising that the fruit crop of this year should, in some cases, have an after effect next year in relative or absolute barrenness. The less need is there for dispute, when it is recalled that there is probably a somewhat narrow margin of time within which the maturing of buds destined for fruit production can be accomplished, and that a tree preoccupied with ripening its crop of fruit may 'miss its tide' by inability at the same time to carry on the somewhat incompatible operation of reconstruction necessary for the next crop of apples.

Among the most interesting of the experiments conducted at Woburn are those on the manuring of fruit trees. The experiments were carried out first on the Ridgemount part of the farm where the soil is a sandy loam 7 in. deep on Oxford clay. In the lower levels of the field the proportion of clay to sand increases, and the soil at the lowermost part becomes a heavy clay. This land has a gradual slope to a brook, and is at its highest part about 15 ft. above the road running thereby. The brook is never dry, and at times overflows and floods the lower part of the ground. The experiments, which extended over twenty-two years, have led to results which in some respects are surprising, and in all deserving of careful consideration. Farm crops (potatoes and onions) grown on the Ridge-

* 'Plant Animals, a Study in Symbiosis.' By Frederick Keeble. Cambridge University Press.

mount soil were found to respond in the usual way to manurial treatment: a dressing of 12 tons of dung to the acre or an equivalent dressing of artificials led to an increase of yield; and a larger dressing, at the rate of 30 tons to the acre, brought about a yet further increase. Similarly nursery stock—one or two year old Paradise or crab stocks—responded generously to manure. Soft fruit—currants, raspberries, gooseberries, etc.—all gave far better results with dung than with artificials. With gooseberries, the use of dung at the rate of 12 tons to the acre more than doubled the growth, and a dressing of 30 tons to the acre increased it nearly sevenfold.

The superior results obtained by the use of dung deserve wide publicity, for although the importance of using dung for bush fruit is now well recognised by all good growers, it is a fact that the neglect of the use of this manure is the cause of many poor crops of bush fruit.

So far, the results obtained at Woburn are not in discord with current practice; but in the case of top fruit—apples, pears, and plums—the experiments carried out on the Ridgemount soil gave results which are somewhat disconcerting. Neither artificial manure nor dung produced any beneficial effect whatever on the trees growing at Ridgemount. In the lighter, poor soil on another part of the station, dung was found however to produce beneficial results, and in this case, as in the case of bush fruit on the Ridgemount soil, it proved to be better than artificials.

It is customary among good growers to regard pruning* and manuring as means supplementary the one to the other in building up a fruit tree and in influencing growth and fertility. If a grower wishes to push a tree into more vigorous growth he applies nitrogenous manures and prunes hard; if he wishes to check growth and produce fruitfulness, he prunes lightly and withholds nitrogenous manures. How then are the negative results obtained on Ridgemount to be explained? There would seem to be no alternative but to conclude either that contemporary practice is wrong or to invoke the doctrine of the limiting factor—that frequently unsuspected agent of experimental error

* 'Winter Pruning: Bush and Half-Standard Apple Trees.' See Ministry of Agriculture Leaflet, No. 322.

or rather of erroneous inference from experiment. The doctrine of the limiting factor may be expressed thus:—Growth is a complex phenomenon. It is conditioned by many factors. Suppose for simplicity's sake that there are only two such factors (*a*) and (*b*). Whether a strengthening of the factor (*a*) will or will not increase growth must depend on the strength of the factor (*b*). For example, growth depends, among other things, on moisture and temperature. If the temperature remain so low as to prevent growth, no increase in the amount of moisture will induce it; and similarly, if moisture is in defect, a rise of temperature will not result in an increased rate of growth.

It may be that the negative results obtained at Ridgemount are to be interpreted in the light of this doctrine. The low-lying position of the ground and the nature of the subsoil lead to the conjecture that the negative results of manuring top fruit are due to the operation of a limiting factor, and that possibly that limiting factor is the low autumn, winter, and spring soil temperature. There is another factor to be taken into consideration: and that is the time factor. It is possible that the effect of manuring on fruit trees may not be apparent for many years after the application of the manure: in any case it is certainly of great importance that the systematic experiments in the manuring of top fruit commenced at Woburn should be continued and extended. The main conclusions to be drawn from the Woburn experiments on manuring are certainly sound. These conclusions are:—With top fruit be sparing with manure. With bush fruit be liberal: eschewing the use of artificials and relying on dung.

Of all the experiments carried out at Woburn none has excited more controversy than those on the pruning and planting of fruit trees. It came as a rude shock to the careful grower to learn of his fruit trees that like

> 'A woman, a dog, and a walnut tree,
> The more you beat them the better they be.'

Many growers were by no means prepared to believe that a fruit tree is all the better for having its roots rammed so hard into the soil at planting time that they are bruised and even crushed. Yet such was proved to be the case by the careful large-scale experiments carried out at Woburn, and the results

must be accepted. Firm planting has always been recognised as essential to the success of fruit trees, and the Woburn method is after all nothing but an unexpected emphasis and confirmation of this practice.

Cultivators of the soil no less than scientific men seek reasons for things and tend in the absence of experimentation to improvise them. One of the most frequent agents in checking progress in the empirical arts is the insufficiency rather than the inexactitude of the reason which is commonly held to account for the success of a given practice. Firm planting, as practised by growers, undoubtedly benefits the plant by preventing the sinking of the soil away from the roots, and growers see therein a sufficient reason for the practice. The Woburn experiments have taught that that reason is insufficient and that, over and above the advantage due to the consolidation of the soil, ramming also produces an increased development in the fibrous or feeding roots, and thereby enables the newly planted tree to get hold of the ground quicker and to supply more materials for the development of the crown.

It is a pity that the experiments have not been examined by botanists, for there is evidently much still to be learned as to the phenomena of root regeneration consequent upon injury. For example, it is known that injury to vegetable tissue induces a wound fever, and it is possible that in the case of roots the local rise of temperature may result in the more rapid formation of new rootlets. One of the prettiest points brought out by the Woburn experiments, to the confusion of the opponents of the practice of ramming, is that no matter how carefully the planting had been done the existing fibrous roots actually died after planting, and in the course of the current season. We may therefore suppose that it is better for the root system as a whole to know the worst at once, so that it may be in case to take remedial measures without delay.

It is less easy to do justice to the Woburn conclusions with respect to pruning, not because their essentials are not to be accepted, but because the objects sought in pruning are so diverse and the method to be adopted must depend so much upon the age of the tree, its inherent habit of growth, and upon the condition of the soil in which the tree is planted. Broadly stated, the conclusion of the Woburn experiments is that the

less a tree is pruned the more fruitful it is. There is no doubt that this doctrine will have the support of most commercial growers. Their experience and their interest alike confirm it, for pruning is a costly and by no means unskilled operation. But before a fruit tree reaches the stage of full bearing it has to live and carry out its growth for many years—in the case of a standard cherry, twenty years; a standard pear, eighteen; a standard apple, fifteen. Even before any crop may be expected some years must elapse after planting: standard cherries, twelve years; pears, ten; and apples, eight.* It is doubtful whether anyone would advocate leaving trees untrained during the years of their adolescence. Mr. Spencer Pickering certainly does not; indeed he advocates pruning, although, as has been said, he would treat the operation as a necessary evil and restrict it as much as possible.

It is probably as a result of the Woburn experiments that attention has recently been directed to the all-important question of pruning varieties according to their kind. Among apples some, such as 'Bramley Seedling' and 'Newton Wonder,' are strong growers; others, like 'Lord Derby' and 'Cox's Orange 'Pippin,' are intermediate; others again, such as 'Grenadier' and Lane's 'Prince Albert,' are weak growers. Contemporary practice takes these habits of growth into consideration when pruning has to be done. With the weak growing varieties, pruning for fruit production is more severe than with the strong growing varieties. A useful account of current practice is to be found in the Ministry of Agriculture Leaflet, No. 322, to which reference should be made by all interested practically in pruning.

If any criticism is to be made upon the Woburn pruning experiments it is that they would appear to have too little regard to the individual and varietal peculiarities of fruit trees. Nevertheless the salutary doctrine of light pruning, although it may seem to be pushed too far by the Duke of Bedford and Mr. Spencer Pickering, is even in its extreme form better than its opposite, for as the authors of the Woburn experiments point

* For table showing bearing age, etc., see 'Fruit growing on Small-'holdings in England and Wales.' Ministry of Agriculture, 'Guides 'to Smallholders,' No. 7. Price 2d. Post free.

out, there are numberless gardens in this country where ruthless and continuous pruning is the sole cause of unfruitfulness.

It is probable that further progress will not be made in constructing a scientific basis for the practice of pruning until the plant physiologist and biochemist turn their attention to the discovery of the chemical or other agents which control and direct the growth of a tree. The Woburn experiments should certainly attract the attention of the investigator to this rich and promising field, and if they succeed in doing this the authors will have rendered yet another conspicuous service to the science and practice of fruit growing. At present, and except for scattered observations and vague generalisations, ignorance is profound with respect to the change of state in a tree which results in the conversion of this year's wood bud into a spur crowned with a fruit bud. The nature of the influence which one bud exercises on another and on the growth of the joint of the stem on which it sits is no less shrouded in mystery. It may be that this fine adjustment and change of growth are due each to specific hormones or chemical stimulators and inhibitors similar in action to those which are known to regulate many physiological processes of the animal body. What is required however is not conjecture but experiment: a repetition of Hunter's advice to Jenner, 'Don't think—try.' Until these things have been tried and resolved a science of pruning will not be established.

The catholicity of the Woburn experiments makes difficult any review which attempts to do more than recite results. At the best only the chief of the results can be discussed, but among these the experiments on the relation of fruit trees to their soil environment must by no means be omitted; for apart altogether from the conclusions of practical value to be drawn from them they are of real importance in adding to our knowledge of the relations of plants with one another and with the soil in which they grow.

So long ago as 1903 the effect of grass on trees was described in the third Report, and the last Report, the seventeenth, now in the press, gives the latest chapter of a story which is of unflagging interest. The fact, first established at Woburn, that grass exercises a remarkable inhibition on the growth of trees, is now accepted by all growers. The effect is most marked in young

trees, but may continue to be exhibited by older and even by fairly mature trees. In practice however the value of the demonstration lies in its warning against premature grassing down of orchards. Once established and in full bearing the orchard may be grassed without serious risk of loss and in certain cases with economic advantage, for although the crop may be less heavy, the grass, besides affording good pasture, may benefit the trees in that the fruit often colours better than on trees in cultivated ground.

The next step in the investigation was to inquire into the possible causes of the 'grass effect,' and here approach was difficult because the ground was unbroken. The more obvious explanation—that the inhibiting effect was the result of competition of grass and tree roots for water or mineral nutriment—was examined experimentally and shown to be untenable. The possibility that in grass land an accumulation of carbon dioxide might inhibit root growth was investigated and put aside, although the suggestion may be made that the possibility of this gas being at the root of the trouble has not been finally put out of court. Winter is the testing time for plants; grass is an opportunist in growth, and it may yet prove that the known anæsthetic effect which carbon dioxide exercises on plants may have to be taken into account. This however is mere conjecture, and in the meantime and until the experiment is tried of grassing down orchards in summer and degrassing during late autumn and winter it may be left on one side.

Having eliminated the obvious, recourse was had to less obvious explanations of the origin of the 'grass effect.' Experiments were carried out by growing grass in soils contained in trays and resting on the soil of pots in which fruit trees were planted, whereby it was secured that the tree roots received no water except that which had passed through the trays. It was shown that by these measures the dwarfing effect was reproduced, and the conclusion was reached that the effect is due to a toxin produced in the soil by the growing grass roots. During the progress of the experiments their scope was extended. It was demonstrated that a similar inhibition is suffered by many forest trees growing in grass: spruce for example makes only 65 per cent. of its normal growth, Scotch fir, birch, and ash about 50 per cent., oak about 35 per cent., and larch 77 per cent.

Thus it follows that the grassing effect is but a special case of the general effect exercised by one crop on another. Again, the authors show that besides the forest and fruit trees referred to already many other plants are susceptible to the baleful influence of a surface crop; among the evildoers already detected are mustard, tobacco, tomatoes, clover, and sixteen species of grasses. So far indeed as the experiments have gone, no plant has been found which refrains from exercising or suffering this toxic effect, the magnitude of which is illustrated in a series of striking photographs on pages 40 and 41. There is even ground for believing that the animal writ that 'wolves do not prey on 'wolves' does not run in the plant world, and that a plant may exercise a maleficent effect upon another of its own kind.

Finally it was proved, as indeed is demanded by poetic justice, that the toxin produced by a root is prejudicial to the plant which produces it, and herein the gardener who insists on well-crocked and well-drained pots may find a new sanction for a time-honoured practice. In mitigation of the toxic action of one plant on another, it is to be observed that the toxin is undoubtedly an unstable substance, and loses its potency very rapidly. Wherefore, in a well-drained soil the damage which the toxin does is probably but small, and in this respect a root toxin resembles the soil toxin produced as the result of heating soils.

Here for the moment the story must end. All who have followed it cannot but admire the energy and ability which have gone to the making of it. The record of the Woburn experiments is one which does honour alike to the authors and to British science: the pioneers have made good.

FREDERICK KEEBLE.

THE WILL IN NATURE

NO enterprise, not even the search for the philosopher's stone, could well seem more hopeless than an attempt to add a modest footnote to the subject of the Will. That sterile province of philosophy is strewn with conclusions which are manifestly inconclusive, and solutions which solve nothing. An occasional tumulus in that dreary desert may represent the thought of a lifetime, long since overwhelmed by controversy and oblivion. Here and there the traveller will stumble on the wreck of a forgotten system, some magnificent foundation that has cracked and fallen at the very moment when its creator attempted to rear his superstructure. In the distance he will see and flee the quaking morass of morals and theology, in which the horrid spectres of predestination and freewill dance and daze the senses. Any adventurous spirit who traverses this gloomy region may well be appalled by the accumulated mass of labour, and the paucity of the result. The most superficial glance at the innumerable discussions of the problem from Job to Schopenhauer seems sufficient evidence that everything has been said which can be said, and the contradictory conclusions furnish abundant evidence that no satisfactory result has been attained.

But the casual spectator of these imposing ruins may be inclined to maintain that one reason for the failure is the fact that the architects attempted to build their edifice before they understood the nature of the materials or the character of the soil. Under the simple substantive of the Will metaphysicians and moralists have grouped a whole series of recondite and refractory problems concerning the capacity of the individual, the government of the universe, and the general body of ethics which derive from the varying conceptions of the one and the other. Since these ultimate matters have so long baffled our inquiries, one may perhaps suggest that no great harm will be done if we ignore them for the moment, and attempt a preliminary analysis of the Will as it appears in the world around us.

Stripped of ulterior implications, the Will in its natural sense appears immediately divisible into various distinctive, separable, and at times completely separated functions. We may distinguish in the first instance the Will to Live which exists throughout the whole animate world, and is almost but not quite coextensive with life itself. From this simple and primary attachment to life appears to be derived, by natural extension, the Will to propagate life which we may conveniently call Desire. This also is common to all life, but is less prolonged as to time, and during that time often deeper as to stress than the Will to Live, of which it is a consequence, and which it frequently supersedes and occasionally extinguishes. Finally there may be discerned, as a force which emerges far later in the evolution of life, a more limited but conscious and intelligent development of the Will, which may be conveniently distinguished from its predecessors as the Purpose. It is with this relatively recent manifestation of purpose, and its connexion real or supposed with that final purpose of the universe which is called the Will of God, that philosophy mainly occupies itself in its study of the Will, tending to ignore, not altogether wisely, any fragmentary light that the precedent manifestations of Will may throw upon the development of a conscious and intelligent purpose.

The primary Will to Live must be accepted as something common to all life; indeed as one of the essential and inherent characteristics of life. Without it growth could not take place nor injuries be repaired. It is the very expression of vital energy, the true origin of faith, and the proper parent of hope. It varies with the physical capacity of its possessor, being naturally strongest in youth, and diminishing slowly but steadily with the declining force of the organism. But it is only in late middle life, when memory conquers hope, when our gaze is no longer forward but backward, when age has begun to displace youth, and the very insignia of decay have stamped their mark upon us, that the Will to Live grows sensibly less. For that reason the young who are cut off by accident or epidemic struggle painfully for life until the last moment because the Will to Live is still strong within them, and fights against premature physical doom; but the very old die easily because the Will to Live has grown feeble, or is even finally extinguished before death calls.

This primary Will to Live is evidently anterior to consciousness and all the subtle and momentous consequences which have sprung from the development of consciousness as a derivative of life, since it exists in creatures which possess at most a passive consciousness, and in others, like the chick in the egg and the babe in the womb, which have as yet no consciousness whatever. It is a necessary quality of the vital force by which animate matter conquers for the time the inertia common to all matter; and it is precedent, both in the individual and in the race, to the struggle for existence.

Life indeed would seem to be inconceivable without it, for if there were no Will to Live, it is probable that life would not go on at all; and if that primary form of Will were seriously weakened, life could hardly have spread with sufficient vigour for the struggle for existence to have developed. If it were possible to imagine the mighty force which has populated earth and sea so feeble that there were only two living things in the world, the one in England and the other in Australia, if the Will to Live was in each of them so nearly impotent that they merely reproduced their kind singly in an individual lifetime and then died content with their work, the world would have been spared the struggle for existence—at the price of its present achievement.

The struggle for existence is the outcome of the second and derivative form of Will, the Will to propagate life, because the latter was so potent a force that it led to the propagation of life in excess, and thereby caused competition and the unending rivalry of the physical world. But the primary Will to Live, that preceded both the Will to propagate life and its consequence the struggle for existence, initiated another and certainly not less momentous conflict—entirely distinct from the struggle for existence, although often confused with it and at times altogether ignored in consequence—the eternal struggle of life with circumstance.

Life in its origin was probably wholly passive and utterly controlled by circumstance. Even then it possessed within itself, as it evidently does now, indefinite potentialities which are still far from fully utilised. But the potentialities were at first entirely latent, and its immediate capacity was nil. We may conceive, if we choose, of life existing for many ages of

unrecorded time in a purely passive state—a blind, unconscious, and undying force that knew no purpose, save the primary and inherent Will to continue which has been defined as the Will to Live.

If it were possible to imagine a living body existing independently in a vacuum, untouched by the pressure of the atmosphere, or waves of heat, light and sound and the contact of other matter, then the life in that body might continue passive, unchanged, and immortal for all eternity. But in fact we know no living body that exists in a vacuum. It is surrounded from the start by circumstance, which affects every moment of its existence and to which it responds continually.

And here it becomes necessary to draw a sharp distinction between primary and secondary circumstance. The former consists of those general conditions which no conceivable power save omnipotence can alter—the position of the planet in space, its physical configuration, its relation to the sun and the rest of the universe. It is clear that life must either conform to these conditions from the start, or perish.

Life has sprung from, and it continues to exist within, a certain limited range of light and heat and pressure of atmosphere; and if that range were disturbed to any appreciable degree whole categories of life that now flourish would immediately become extinct and others dependent on them would speedily die out. It is true that animals and vegetation possess a certain varying power of accommodation to changed conditions of life; but the limits within which they can accommodate themselves to altered environment are not, in the sense in which the physicist would use the word, very wide. Every geological period sees hundreds of species destroyed. But even the stupendous change wrought by a new geological epoch may be regarded as a relatively minor revolution in primary circumstance. It does not alter the position of the planet in space, it cannot affect even our nearest neighbours in our immediate solar system, and would pass entirely unobserved by the inhabitants of any other system. Any grave or sudden disturbance of the fundamental conditions on which existence is based would probably extinguish life upon this planet altogether.

Secondary circumstance, on the other hand, consists of those lesser local and derivative conditions which time and experience

have proved malleable. Many of these, like fire and water and other potential sources of power, existed before life but are obedient to intelligent direction; some, such as the various forms of society among bees, wasps, ants, and our own less stable civilisation, are directly dependent for their existence on the development of life itself, and might more truly be called tertiary circumstance in a final analysis of causes. We are truly the creatures of circumstance; but in some measure we mould that circumstance, consciously or unconsciously, to our own ends. If environment has shaped us, we in turn have helped to shape our environment.

It is this fact which always and everywhere distinguishes animate from inanimate matter. That which is lifeless submits entirely to circumstance, simply because it is lifeless. The rain falls, the rock crumbles, the river flows, the cliff disintegrates, in exact response to the pressure and stress of circumstance; a mathematician in possession of the facts could predict the course of their involuntary action with the same precise exactitude that he foretells the majestic procession of the stars. But that which has the elements of life differs absolutely from that which has not in this essential particular, that while both at the start were passive and impotent before circumstance, life alone possessed the potentiality of reaction and eventual resistance to circumstance which only the varying play of circumstance upon the living organism could evoke. Life therefore held within itself the element of liberty and the capacity for freedom. The most ephemeral fly, which lives but an hour in the afternoon sun, contains within its fragile body more liberty than the sun in his eternal splendour has ever possessed. Even the lowest and most disgusting forms of life are, in this respect, superior to the greatest of lifeless forces. The louse and the bug can at least choose their victim, and desert one for another; but neither Sirius nor Andromeda may deviate by an inch from the course determined for them by external factors.

Had circumstance never varied, it is possible that life would never have advanced beyond its original passive and receptive state. But since the whole universe is in motion, it necessarily follows that even primary circumstance has variety—the variation of day and night and of the seasons, of wind and weather, heat and cold. These and the thousand subtle gradations of degree

and change and repetition affect the object, whether living or lifeless, with which they come in contact. But the lifeless merely suffers; the living reacts. From the first the variation of external circumstance must have presented something of the nature of choice to even the simplest living organism, which would shrink from some things and respond to others, and to that extent would exercise freedom of the Will.

Moreover, from the moment the living organism was free to choose between one course and another, there was a better and a worse—and it is permissible to suggest that that simple alternative was in its essence the origin of good and evil. It is in the subsequent developments of choice and discrimination that we see the elements of the faculty of judgment, and of that weighing of two or more courses which eventually forms one at least of the sources of the intellect and reason. But the long road from the partial freedom of the Will to intelligent Purpose is paved throughout at every step, and often blocked and barred completely, by the limitations and restrictions imposed by circumstance.

Life then in its original forms was passive, but capable of responding, and indeed compelled to respond to external stimulus. All the senses bear the marks of their involuntary origin as a response of the living organism to external stimulus. But while the senses are involuntary, their extensions are not. Somewhere on the long path of development the transition from passive to active occurred; the external stimulus applied to the organism possessed only of the Will to Live, kindled in it, perhaps at the moment of some sudden crisis when an unusual stress evoked an unprecedentedly strong response, a Will to Action, and the momentous discovery was made that action was tantamount to power.

Action necessarily means movement; and, since that which moves is to the extent of that particular movement for the time being superior to circumstance, the capacity for movement implies to the extent of that capacity the possession of power. But since the only source of power is circumstance, we see life striving everywhere to become active in order to obtain power from circumstance, and to widen its range of action. Activity connotes work; and it follows that it is an essential property of life to work. Only that which works has the right—if one can

properly use an ethical term in this connexion—to live. But in the long run the only right to live is furnished by the power to go on living.

Activity is movement—the movement of atmosphere and matter. But since life itself resides in matter, which is by nature inert, circumstance and inertia pull eternally at the skirt of life. The lowest forms of life are those which cannot move and are utterly bounded by circumstance; the higher the form, the more has it freed itself from its immediate environment. The evolution of flight is the most obvious instance of creatures that have risen superior to circumstance by enlarging their power of movement. Because it has developed wings and thus enlarged its ancestral environment, the bird is superior to the reptile from which it has sprung, first physically and then intellectually.

Some of the lower forms of life have fought their brief fight with circumstance for the power of movement, and failed. Many classes of animals whose whole existence appears to be fixed and stationary have a short period of freedom at the start. Brachiopoda, medusæ, ascidians, and sponges begin life with certain locomotive powers which are quickly lost. An absolutely overwhelming instinct apparently dictates the exchange of the adventurous for the settled character; indeed, settlement seems to be the very condition of their existence, for the black spat of oysters possesses similar freedom at birth, but if no permanent abode is found within forty-eight hours, it perishes. In these cases the secondary Will to Action, which is a condition of progress, is speedily extinguished by the urgent and superior claims of the primary Will to Live. Action dies because life continues.

Circumstance then may either be submitted to entirely by the weak, or adapted to their own purpose by the physically strong or the mentally intelligent. In the latter case we boast that we have conquered circumstance. The expression may pass; but whether we submit or conquer, circumstance in the end insists on a method of action which becomes habitual and a way of growth which becomes hereditary, and the two together are almost impossible to break. In loosening one set of chains we forge others; in rising above the plain we build the mountain on which we stand; but our place is henceforth fixed upon the mountain, not the plain. It is the revenge of circumstance on

that which has conquered it, or rather the price which circumstance demands for the path we have driven through its territory.

How great that price may be it is impossible to say, nor into what devious and dilatory paths circumstance, with its inevitable allies of time and chance, have driven life and the Will to Live. Circumstance indeed seems unable finally to conquer life, since life has ever the quality of freedom which is the eternal enemy of inert environment and permits escape. It is in that sense, and perhaps in that alone, that even the materialist is at times almost driven by his own logic into confessing that life is a spiritual force. But circumstance, which cannot control life, can at least in the long run always ensure death; and this has given it perhaps the greatest of all its victories. Had life, in its revolution from passive to active, not stolen power from circumstance it could never have progressed; but since progress is movement, life is compelled to move not only on matter but through matter; continually it absorbs, transmutes and rejects; the matter dies, the life remains. But sometimes the matter which dies is that which we call an individual being; for he too is matter through which life passes to his children.

Death is necessarily the end of the Will to Live in that particular organism. But life and the Will to Live are not thus easily conquered. Since death is the condition of progress, the Will to Live has inevitably taken other form, and it has issued in the Will to propagate.

This derivative Will, which we have called Desire, and which seems a disturbance and readjustment of the primary Will to Live, has produced an extraordinary variety of sexual form and range, and everywhere caused production in excess. From this excessive production springs the struggle for existence, which is at bottom mainly a contest for power; but the fact that nearly all forms of life appear to breed beyond the limit of subsistence, seems to show that life is more vigorous as a force than the forms on which it is based or through which it passes. From which some may perhaps draw the rather dubious conclusion that Life in the end may finally subdue circumstance.

The Will to Live then came into conflict with circumstance long before the struggle for existence. If it be true that circumstance, which is inert matter, conquered or at least frustrated the Will to Live, in the sense of deflecting it so that the only

escape from annihilation lay through the Will to propagate, then the imperious working of the latter force is partially explained ; the command to increase and multiply was given in the first instance, not to Abraham, but to the very protozoa and so onwards to all their successors.

It is in fact conceivable that the whole varied range of sexual divergence with its innumerable forms, may be nothing more than the effect of circumstance reacting on the living organism which, in its struggle to escape annihilation, took any road, and not necessarily the best road, that offered it the chance of continuance. From this innate determination, not merely to live but to go on living by reproducing our kind on a large—and indeed in most cases on a more than adequate—scale, sprang the struggle for existence, and its ultimate consequence, the evolution of a purpose.

Once more persistent circumstance and baulked life, now attuned to the struggle for existence, began the unending game for the victory that neither can finally achieve. But with the commencement of the struggle for existence there evolved of necessity, in addition to the original variety of primary circumstance, a further variety of secondary circumstance. As one nascent species developed in one direction, a second diverged in another direction, while a third, apparently suited to its simple environment, and consequently devoid of incentive to change, stood still, and therefore relatively went backwards in the scale. It is clear that such increased variety meant a further range of choice and increased possibilities of discrimination and power to the successful.

The Will to Action (which has so obsessed German philosophy under the name of the Will to Power) developed enormously when the struggle for life began, out of the competition for space and air and food between rival organisms. Of two passive forms, the one which succeeded best would be the stronger and more capable, and to that extent less passive ; and the successful organism would therefore have taken the first step on the long road which leads from mere acceptance of, and reaction to, the conditions of its environment, towards the active life of choice, discrimination, and movement, which profits from environment and in the end succeeds in changing its environment for more favourable conditions. At every step along that road the Will

drew nearer to the level of consciousness and freedom, and its later offspring, Purpose.

The struggle for existence is seen in full force among plants, with whom competition for light and air and soil is continuous and keen. But vegetation, being hampered by lack of independent movement, could not advance more than the first step along the path to consciousness and purpose; for the faculty of free movement is still the condition of progress and emancipation from circumstance.

Animal life freed itself, with some exceptions, from the limitations which hampered plant life. With the emergence of the faculty of locomotion, it enlarged the range of choice, and whereas the plant was still mainly an organism that responded passively to environment, the animal became an organism that possessed the active power, in some varying degree, of changing its environment. That fact constituted a revolutionary distinction of Will. To the mere Will to Live and to propagate was now slowly added the choice how to live.

The mere fact that the struggle with circumstance and its consequence, the struggle for existence, permitted even a limited degree of freedom to life forbade the active to possess stability or espouse her colourless sister, content. Only in a few instances have living organisms become so absolutely fitted to their environment that they have persisted unchanged through every geological period; and it is by no accident that these are all forms which rank low in the scale of life. The great bulk of animate matter is in a state of continual flux, progression, and retrogression; we all indeed seek stability as a form of pact with circumstance, but in seeking it we build our brief and temporary habitation on the side of a precipice. Movement and variety are the very conditions of progress. For that reason contentment, the virtue of the timid, is impossible to those who have inherited freedom; and resignation, the superlative of content, would simply lead to extinction.

Whether contentment is ethically a good thing or a bad will not be argued here. It is, in its last analysis, the backward pull of circumstance on life; and absolute content is therefore only possible to those who make complete surrender to circumstance. It is the property of the oyster not of man, who cannot, even if he would, resign his long heritage of conquest over circumstance.

Throughout all Nature, as in our own race, it is only to the daring and adventurous that adventures and consequently success can come; but the contented take no risks, they desire no adventure, they achieve no success, they attain no power.*

The most primitive orders are passive and entirely dependent on circumstance. But even among those which rank relatively low, many have made the first step towards the conquest of their surroundings by the evolution of organs which permit them a wider range of circumstance. For instance (says Johan Hjort in 'The Depths of the Ocean'), the families in pelagic plant life that

'are endowed with locomotive organs, are very scantily represented, and even amongst the few that are thus favoured, several species make use of them for quite a different purpose, employing them as organs to secrete mucilage and thus keep the cells united in chains. Most of the pelagic diatoms belong to families that lack organs of locomotion, though by way of compensation various types have highly developed suspension organs, which increase their superficies and consequently their friction against the surrounding water-masses. It is possible too that these algæ are able to reduce weight by evolving specifically lighter matter, such as fat, within the cells or air-bladders outside them.'

Many lowly marine organisms however possess the capacity to float or sink at will, and have developed appendages to regulate their movements. The same author remarks that the copepods show

'magnificent devices for enlarging their surface, developing feather, plate, or rod-shaped appendages; the surface resistance of these appendages depends on their position in the vertical line, and thus they serve the purpose of vertical locomotion as well.'

In these and other instances the attainment of power over the environment was clearly precedent to the possession of mental consciousness, since the most ardent admirer of algæ and copepods must acquit them of a brain and intelligent purpose.

---

* Perhaps when Eve ate the apple, it was only because she was discontented with an externally imposed limitation. At least she succeeded in enlarging her environment.

The desire of the moth for the star is simply, in prosaic language, the universal desire for something we have not got; the desire of the night for the morrow is the feeling of vague optimism that the future may be better than the past. The fact that we all have these feelings merely shows that we are all discontented with our present record of achievement.

Accident and chance undoubtedly counted for much in the road which led to power. That daring animal which first realised by experimental proof that the flesh of another animal was good to eat, either by way of change from a hitherto invariable diet of leaves and grass, or as the result of post-mortem curiosity which led him to a personal investigation of the body of a late rival for a pasture which only sufficed for one, not only succeeded in enlarging his own range of possible sustenance, but at the same time reduced the competition. The possession of power was worth while; it paid both in security and sustenance.

In the first instance no doubt power was not consciously sought. It lay ready to hand, and those who utilised it most effectively were the most successful in the battle for life. Through the exercise of power they secured more; their consequent gradual elevation in the scale of life transformed them slowly from the purely passive to the partially active, and in the end they directly sought power.

By that road active consciousness was developed; the passive Will to Live became the conscious Will to Action, because action secured an increment of power, and power increased the assurance and raised the standard of life. Ambition is clearly the conscious pursuit of power which follows the realisation of its utility. By that sin the angels may indeed have fallen, but by the possession of that quality terrestrial life enlarged its range and standing. Naturally too the attainment of power may change the character, because the wider range of circumstance which power secures, or even transplantation into a different soil and atmosphere, will bring out traits which were previously only latent, or even develop entirely new characteristics. Examples of slaves who have become tyrants, and Churches which have turned from meakness to persecution when no longer themselves persecuted, could no doubt be paralleled in the unwritten history of predatory Nature.

But those records are perhaps finally lost, for the beginning of the silent contest for power preceded consciousness, and manifestly led directly to active mentality and to the intellect, which is the highest instrument of power. Nor has the intellect even yet caught up its predecessor. It is the great trouble of humanity that it does not understand how to utilise the power which it has

understood how to generate. Power is desired as an end in itself, not as a means to an end; and once again purpose lags behind possession.

The universal contest for power has done much to make the world what it is;* it has involved the rivalry and enmity of species, families, and individuals; and the records of the triumphs and disasters it has caused are written large in Nature. The struggle has issued in three main results—force, persuasion, and submission.

The forcible and violent conflict of individual Will was evidently the earliest outcome of the desire for power. Physical strength ruled the world before intelligence was born; but as intelligence grew, it became clear that force was not all-sufficing, and persuasion began to play its part. But persuasion makes necessarily a late and rare appearance in life, and for most the alternative to the triumph of force was plain submission to circumstance.

Three divergent instances of the submission of the Will to circumstance may here be briefly mentioned in the familiar phenomena of *mimicry*, *domestication*, and *parasitism*. The first is often the consequence of instinct, the second more generally of intellect; and, since instinct is more prevalent than intellect, mimicry is more common than domestication. Parasitism, on the other hand, is always the cause or the consequence of degeneracy.

Mimicry, or protective resemblance in colouring or appearance to the surroundings, is a visible recognition and admission of the power of circumstance, here displayed as a neutral background, of which the strong take advantage for offence and the weak for defence. The great carnivora adopt the stripes and spots of sun and shade in their native forests to conceal their movements. The Siberian tiger and Polar bear are white as the snow in which they dwell. The mantis insect (*Gongylus gongylodes*) simulates a flower to deceive its prey.

In these cases mimicry is an accessory of offence; more generally it is the foundation of defence, and innumerable classes have found safety from enemies in imitation of their surroundings and relative invisibility. But this is in itself a plain sub-

* Not everything, or love would not exist.

mission to circumstance, and it imposes a consequent limitation on the Will. The animal that adopts protective mimicry as the condition of security can never belong to a dominant type; the more perfect the mimicry, the less dominant the type.

There are insects which imitate with scrupulous fidelity the foliage in which they live, or adopt the external form of very different animals with whom they consort. The device purchases security—within the limited range of the foliage or tribe to which the mimic is attached; divorced from its surroundings, the animal at once appears conspicuous against an unaccustomed background. Submission to circumstance is therefore the price of its continued existence.

But it is highly significant that the most perfect examples of mimicry, or submission to circumstance, are generally confined to the female. In many instances the male of the species is conspicuous and provided with wings for flight, while the female is wingless and entirely imitative of her surroundings. The reason for the contrast between the sexes is clear. The life of the male is less important for the species than that of the female, and he is therefore free to seek variety and adventure, while his mate, specialised for one vital end, produces the next generation in security. The mimicry may, to some extent, result from the lack of locomotive ability imposed on the female by her maternal duties. Those who hunt for analogies may perhaps observe that the same position applies universally, for it is proverbial that women are more submissive to their environment, and take their colour more obediently from their surroundings than men.

The question whether mimicry is conscious and determined from within by intelligent purpose, or unconscious and dictated from without by the weight of circumstance, is an extraordinarily difficult problem, and it would be impossible to marshal the mass of conflicting evidence in these brief pages. On the one hand imitation, which is essentially mimicry, is apparently an instinctive faculty in all life; there is a universal tendency to submit to our surroundings; and mimicry is resorted to by types so relatively low in the scale that we can hardly conceive its operation to be the result of intelligent purpose.

On the other hand, the fact that noxious or poisonous animals are frequently clad in conspicuous colours for the purpose of warning the unwary—a species of mimicry reversed—could be

used as an argument for intelligent purpose; in these cases the essence of protection is defiance of environment, which is anything but submission of the Will. And even in sheer mimicry there are cases hardly susceptible of the explanation of unconscious imitation. The American Hag-moth (*Phobetron pithecium*), a type not of the highest standing among the lepidoptera, which themselves do not rank as the most intelligent order of insects, finds it convenient to imitate a dead leaf for its cocoon: but

'if the caterpillar cannot find at hand a suitable place in which to weave its cocoon, it frequently makes for itself more satisfactory surroundings by killing the leaves, upon which, after they have become dry and brown in colour, it places its cocoon. Several of these caterpillars unite together, and selecting a long and vigorous immature shoot or leader of the orange tree, they kill it by cutting into its base until it wilts and turns over.'*

If that is not intelligent purpose and prevision, it is difficult to say what is.

Domestication, or the enslavement of one species by another, which we see in the domestic animals employed by man and the ants, is an example of the submission of the will to secondary circumstance in the shape of superior intelligence. Here the animal barters its freedom for security and protection; both its individual and its racial life are controlled by its proprietor, and profound differences of structure may result from the discipline to which it is subjected. It is significant that predatory, nocturnal, or carnivorous animals, in whom the Will is strong, are seldom domesticated.

Both man and the ants have also adopted slavery for part of their own species as well as forcing it on others, which is perhaps a sign that the struggle for power has gone to greater lengths and been more ruthless in these two orders than in others. For the extent of our freedom bears precise ratio to the extent of our power. The essence of slavery is not the treatment, but the impotence, of the slave; the essence of villainage was neither the services nor the wages, but the fact that the villain was tied to the soil. He bartered his freedom for security.

Parasitism, unlike slavery, which may be imposed from above on the unwilling, is invariably initiated from below. No animal

* *Insects Affecting the Orange* (Washington, 1885).

knowingly encourages another to live in its body; the parasite always seeks the host, not the host the parasite. In some cases the one and only action of the parasite during life is to seek the host on whom to live; that end achieved, it becomes entirely passive. But in many instances, even that one action is intermitted, and the parasite leaves the discovery of the host entirely to chance, with the result that an extremely small proportion of the parasites produced by the parent survive.

It seems impossible to conceive a more feeble degree of Will than this, for the parasite's whole life is conditioned by its host, and the death of the host—sometimes brought about by the parasite—almost necessarily involves the death of the uninvited guest.

Parasitism may have occurred in the first instance either by chance or design; in most cases the original introduction to the body of the host was probably the result of accident. But the parasite discovered that existence of a kind was possible under these conditions; the habit was formed, heredity made that habit unbreakable, and the species submitted permanently to the more limited range entailed by absolute passivity.

Parasitism is the third and lowest stage of submission to circumstance, of which mimicry is the first and domestication the second stage. All three entail considerable modifications of external structure and internal Will. But mimicry is to some extent common to us all; its adoption is only a question of degree, and it is often confined, in its more extreme form, to one sex for one particular purpose. It does not necessarily involve degradation of the species or degeneration of the individual; it merely stereotypes its position and forbids its further evolution.

Domestication involves a more complete submission of the Will; the species is bred for the particular purpose of its master, and its range and number and even its continuance to exist depend entirely on his Will. But it is noteworthy that the males of domestic animals, like the males of the mimics, are less submissive to circumstance than the females. Domestication, again, does not involve degeneration, since the domesticated species is bred entirely for the purpose of utility; but that useful purpose may be either beef or wool, or in the case of the dog, a combination of physical and mental characters. If the individual does not conform to that external purpose, it is destroyed. To that

extent, therefore, domestication implies degradation. Parasitism, on the other hand, involves degeneration of parts and senses of the parasitic organism, in consequence of the almost complete and absolute submission of Will. It may be forced to revert to a more primitive method of reproduction, or its sexual history may become extraordinarily complex as a result of its passive existence, compelling it to adopt any expedient in order to continue the species. Only the fact that it does so continue, despite its fundamental policy of taking the line of least resistance, shows that even in that sluggish and contemptible organism the primary Will to Live still persists in unabated force, when every other form of Will has perished.

The power then that accrued from the increased range of active movement enlarged the scope of the Will for the successful; while relative or absolute submission to circumstance, with stagnation or degeneration in its train, was the lot of the unsuccessful. But the enlargement of the Will entailed direct and momentous consequences in the development of consciousness.

An exact definition of consciousness will not here be attempted; indeed, it seems increasingly likely that exact definition may be in the very nature of things impossible. If consciousness be a consequence of the evolution of life—and life has evolved continuously from the simple to the complex—there may be no precise moment at which we can say that consciousness began to exist, and equally no precise moment at which latent and passive consciousness became active and purposeful. The one may have merged into the other by silent and impalpable stages which psychic history will seek in vain to separate.

Consciousness in any active sense depends, as St. Augustine saw, on the continuance of physical attention. But with many animals, even among those which rank relatively high, consciousness still appears frequently to remain in the inferior passive and latent condition, since external stimulus is needed to excite attention; when no external stimulus appears, attention lapses or disintegrates, and drowsy lethargy overtakes the creature. In the higher animals alone, and more particularly in man, has consciousness risen to the superior and active condition in which it does not necessarily require external stimulus, but can concentrate attention on its own thoughts.

It appears to be the fact that in the earlier stages of life,

thinking is only resorted to when the need for thought compels the living organism to think. At a later stage this is not strictly accurate; the brain has manifestly increased its range and its activity, and men—or let us say some few men—take pleasure in thinking, without being driven to it by external circumstance.

External environment in the shape of prey, and internal stimulus in the shape of hunger, compel the hippopotamus to hunt, and to think within the limits necessary to successful hunting. External environment in the shape of the Greek city-state obviously influenced the form of Plato's Republic, but certainly it did not compel him to write it, or every fellow-citizen would also have produced a similar political treatise; the internal influence was the power of active thought, in which Plato happened to excel his contemporaries. The difference between the hippopotamus and Plato therefore lies in the range and power of active thought.

It may be suggested that the development of Will and consciousness from the possession of power should have produced a larger range of thought earlier in the scale of life, and that our illustrative hippopotamus should have conceived, not indeed an ideal republic to charm and perhaps delude every generation of his successors, but at least a practical hippopotamopolis. But to argue thus is to forget that the power of active thought is still rare and limited even in the case of man, and it ignores the external influence of circumstance on life.

The enlarged mental range even of the successful and active seeker after power was continually limited by the operation of habit and its outcome, instinct, which inhibits the Will in various directions by the compelling force of ancestral authority, tribal custom, and contemporary environment. And since habit and instinct operate on acts that are frequently repeated, it is plain that the Will is inhibited in matters of considerable importance to the organism. But habit is no more than the general tendency of all matter, and of mental not less than physical matter, towards inertia and unconsciousness; and instinct, which is stereotyped and hereditary habit, is therefore the retort of material circumstance upon the conscious mental will.

Every living thing inherits the fruits of the victories or defeats of its ancestors in the long struggle of life with circum-

stance, and receives the advantages or pays the cost of those victories or defeats in the potentialities or limitations which the struggle has left the organism. Whether we influence or are influenced by circumstance, each successive act stamps its mark upon the character of the individual and its offspring, and every day is a day of judgment, silent, irrevocable, and to that extent conclusive. That which is done it appears that God Himself cannot undo; and it is perhaps to this, rather than to the absence of desire, that the great French writer should have ascribed the awful melancholy which he attributed to omnipotence.

But material circumstance, in the guise of habit, again failed to conquer life and the Will to Live completely; for while it stabilised much nascent mentality as instinct, part at least remained free and developed into intelligence. Instinct is the passive daughter of circumstance by habit, while intelligence is the active son of life. Somewhere in the debatable territory occupied by these rival manifestations of consciousness will be found the original seat of the third and final phase which the Will has assumed in its endless conflict with circumstance—the intelligent Will or Purpose.

If these deductions be correct, the Will in Nature is not altogether the Will of metaphysics. The Will in our analysis is both bound and free—free within certain limits and bound, or rather impotent, beyond that variable frontier. It derives directly from life, but it has been forced by circumstance, the steadfast enemy and apparently the eternal partner of life, into many strange byways. Of these, propagation, sexual or asexual, is one; environment alternately provoking revolt or compelling submission is a second; and the development of intelligent purpose, still rare and occasional, but perhaps increasing, is a third.

A. Wyatt Tilby.

SOME FEMININE AUTOBIOGRAPHIES

1. **The Life of Liza Lehmann.** By HERSELF. Fisher Unwin. 1919.
2. **The Worlds and I.** By ELLA WHEELER WILCOX. Gay & Hancock. 1919.
3. **Impressions that Remained.** By ETHEL SMYTH. Longmans, Green. 1919.

THE number of women who have written autobiographies is extremely small, but considering the proportion of male to female writers, the number of men who have done so is not much larger. The incautious on reading these words may leap up with a host of instances, but they must be requested to pass them through a very close sieve which will reject all the journals, sketches, and autobiographical reminiscences, all jottings about contemporary personages, and all those records of mere events which are shown as happening to a body that we have not seen, and touching a personality into which we are not allowed to penetrate. Sir David Hunter Blair, for instance, recently published a book of conversational reminiscences covering with some minuteness the experiences of a long and active life, but since he omitted the vital experiences, this book is no more autobiography than a list of the kings of England is history. Equally the diaries of Augustus Hare and Crabb Robinson are not autobiographies, for their chief interest, to the writer as well as to the reader, is their recollection of other individuals who passed before the observant gaze of the diarist.

The true autobiography has one interest only, that of the author's personality as it appeared to himself; that is the matter of his work which will succeed or fail, according as he is or is not capable of dealing with it as an artist. The rarity of good autobiographies is easily accounted for by the extraordinary difficulty of grasping and using this content. Painters often paint their own portraits, though not all with the success that Rembrandt and Sir William Orpen have attained. Nevertheless, any painter, compared with an autobiographer, has an easy task. That all important accessory, the looking-glass, is given to him

from without; he has but to put it in front of him and look into it to see his features very much as they appear to the world at large. He can observe them, if he care to do so, set in contemplation, distorted by emotion, or serene in contentment. The autobiographer has to make his own looking-glass, and this feat of mental construction is beyond the reach of all but the specially gifted. Possession of the highest intellectual gifts does not guarantee the possession of this one; while there are men of ordinary abilities, like William Hickey, who develop if without any effort.

It is a peculiar faculty, this power to see oneself standing out as the central figure of a world humming with notable events and crowded with greater and more conspicuous personalities; it is the power of selection and concentration that lies in every artist applied within instead of without. But this special faculty of vision is not all; a special use has to be made of it. It may be reserved by its possessor for a secret mental exercise, it may inspire poetry, it may furnish the material for imaginative fiction, or lastly it may project a self-image so conspicuous and so compelling as to prompt the great act of faithful reconstruction which is an autobiography in its only proper sense, the story of a personality. Autobiography is only fiction, but a fiction in which the triumph of the imagination in recreating the unity of personality is so illuminative that, in the matter of external events and their sequence, or even of the sequence of mental states, realism can be pushed to its utmost limit, which is the exact reproduction of circumstances, with as much accuracy as memory, assisted by written record, can achieve.

Autobiography is a work of art; it is a novel, a poem, a drama. Any experience would furnish the matter, but the power to objectify and reproduce it is so rare. Works of art in which external events can be arbitrarily selected by the imagination may be more orderly, their modelling cleaner, their process to the climaxes surer, their catastrophes more overwhelming, but, whereas these are only endowed with likelihood, the tremendous force of actuality breathes through an autobiography with a more than compensating effect. The effect of truth, so far as it is humanly possible, upon consciousness is extraordinarily powerful; it may be judged in the careful discrimination which children make between what is told to

them as true and what is 'make-believe,' and by the enormously increased coefficient of emotion on our part which attends some narrative of joy or sorrow when we know that living beings, not airy creations of the brain, were the actors in it.

With this emotional thrust of truth behind it autobiography can cover its oddities of construction and any defiance of dramatic traditions which may be forced upon it by circumstances. But it can only gain the full effect from its advantages if the artistic imagination, used autobiographically, has successfully exercised itself in attaining the essential unity. Diaries and journals fall short of the full effect for this very reason; they are mosaics, not particularly well fitted together, little fragments of personality chipped off from day to day, observed now in one medium now in another, confused with other events and other personalities, the parts wanting relief, and the whole falling short of unity. The autobiographer worthy of the name takes his stand firmly at a definite time and in a definite place; there, planting his easel, he proceeds to summon up his own image as a central and all-absorbing reality, one amid all its dramatic changes and chances. It is the intensity of the absorption that produces the reflection in which a strange but fascinating *Doppelgänger* is thrown up against the arras of the years, fearful, wonderful, almost unbelievable. And the act of literary recreation is nearly an agony, so intense is the anxiety of the artist to reveal his own vision to others.

This anxiety of the artist, even though it seem to the author moral and not æsthetic, is inseparable from a great autobiographical creation. It sounds like a *canto fermo* all through what is perhaps the greatest autobiography ever written, Rousseau's 'Confessions.' It appeared to Rousseau of overwhelming importance that he should counteract the calumnies of his enemies by stripping his soul naked to show that, with all its blemishes, it was at least as good as that of any other man; and though, even in this ecstasy of truth-telling, he did not tell the truth, he produced a self-portrait of such amazing quality that this very creation modified the truth for ever afterwards. If the highest standard is the best standard, then the test of approximation to the qualities of Rousseau's 'Confessions' is an excellent one to apply to an autobiography.

Fanny Burney wrote an entertaining journal; the Comtesse

de Boigne and the Duchesse de Dino—to mention some recent examples of a numerous category—left some diverting records of contemporary life; and Mrs. Humphrey Ward not long ago gave us a synopsis of her movements on the stage of life without much reference to the inner promptings which caused them. None of these, however, are autobiographies, and a close mesh will also reject the periodical hauls which Marie Bashkirtseff exhibited as the fruits of trawling in the disturbed but shallow waters of her soul. In fact, there are hardly any women who, in writing of themselves, have been able to objectify themselves into an absorbing whole to the extent which is essential for successful autobiography.

At first sight this fact seems hard of explanation. Women are not remarkable for want of interest in themselves, particularly those who write; they display freely those kinds of egotism which are called vanity, selfishness, and morbid introspection. As a sex they are more self-conscious than men, being as a rule profoundly aware of their own appearances and attitudes, acute in the selection of favourable backgrounds, often more honest judges of themselves than are men, since they can use this clear judgment to their own advantage. The personality of illuminated unconsciousness, the Parsifal-type, is not feminine, for their circumstances have always forced upon women a consciousness of themselves and of their influence. In spite of this, women have usually preferred, where they made use of their self-knowledge artistically, to do so in the less circumscribed form of fiction, whether in prose or verse, rather than in the historical track of autobiography.

This may be partly explained, perhaps, by the greater secretiveness of women with regard to themselves, of which their delicacy about their exact age is only a minor symptom. The physical and emotional frankness of men has for women something rather repulsive; they cling passionately to their last draperies even among themselves, and naturally regard the voluntary assumption of even the noblest state of nudity in public as an act of self-violation. Also, they are less at ease than men in dealing with abstractions: they shy at propositions stated in general terms if they cannot immediately make some particular application of them. There is no more patent abstraction than a comprehensive view of oneself against the

background of all nature and all humanity, for the outlines of the self are fluid and merge as irritatingly into nature and other humanity as two brushfuls of water-colour paint laid side by side. The woman naturally applies her self-judgments to particular cases, so that her image of herself is more of a series of attitudes than of an elusive unity which, while adopting or submitting to attitudes, is superior to and beyond them.

Finally, women have not as a rule that greater egotism of the man which concentrates itself upon its aims and ambitions, making their attainment, however the process may be diversified by distractions, passions, duties, and enjoyments, the supreme effort of his will, blunting his sensibilities, cooling his sympathies, softening sorrow, and diminishing pleasure, even in the moment of its fruition. This vivid consciousness of purpose gives to personality strong line and relief; it gives expression to the features of the self-image, and direction to its glance, and without it the lines are apt to be nebulous, the features ill-defined, and the glance shifting. To make up for these deficiencies the cosmetic art of fiction has to be called in whereby a woman may touch herself up into the appearance of a heroine; while a man, with his incurable romanticism, can contemplate himself as hero in as plain a record of circumstances as his diary or his memory can give him. While she is busy with the make-up box, he, more astute, attends to the lighting of the stage.

But these fancies must not be pursued too far, since autobiographical fiction is just as common among men as women. Balzac and Dickens threw into their novels as freely as Charlotte Brontë or George Eliot the material which might have figured in their autobiographies; and Mr. Festing Jones, in his 'Life of 'Samuel Butler,' has lately shown what lumps of authenticity a man could deliberately cast into the mould of fiction. More men have written of themselves like Rousseau than women have written of themselves like Georges Sand—that much can be said with truth. The explanation may be inherent in the differences between the sexes, as I have suggested, but that this explanation may be a delusion, I frankly admit. Some recent autobiographical books by women, two of them musicians and one a poet, will at least throw some light upon the differences between reminiscence and autobiography.

Liza Lehmann's unpretentious book is reminiscence pure and simple—a scrappy record, written shortly before her death, of a happy and successful life. Whether her own personality was represented by the melodious but unexciting music of 'In a 'Persian Garden' or no, there is little trace of it in her written 'Life.' There is in it not even the most rudimentary focussing of herself against a background, so that nothing stands out from her pages but the apparent fact that her way through life—remarkably enough for a musician—was attended by no storms, stumblings, or losings of the way. As a composer she certainly had the power of artistic presentation, and as a singer too: as a writer she has none. There are people who, with an indifference to the interest of their own personality, combine a gift of acutely observing and reproducing the personalities of other people. Mr. Edmund Gosse is an admirable living instance of this kind. The chance occurs to every one, but few take advantage of it, and Liza Lehmann was not one of these.

In fact, as autobiography, her book is simply of negative interest, showing how matter for an artistic representation of an experience is thrown away by ignorance or incapability of handling the form, also by the absence of the particular imaginative power required for its successful treatment. The young study their parents closely and keenly, with what effect all good autobiographies inevitably show. Rousseau's pictures of his parents are immortal. Mrs. Wilcox and Miss Ethel Smyth, each in her own way, contrive to present their parents as living people, abounding, as most people do, both in tragedy and comedy. Liza Lehmann, even when she observed, was content to state the result baldly and tritely; she clearly had not the essential interest of a biographer or an autobiographer in the conflict of human wills when she could write a passage like this:—

'Looking back into the distant past, I can now see how my mother's passion for music led to difficulties in the home life. My father, who was *not* musical, resented that his wife should give most of her time and thought to the development of a dormant gift, and—here was the crux—after all the hours devoted to the study, could scarcely ever be induced to produce the results for the pleasure and entertainment of her large and clamorous circle of friends. My father would very naturally have enjoyed being proud of her, and her additional popular success would have been in a way a compensation for many sacrifices. And so it came about that there was often a little rift within the lute.

The disparity in age, for my father was twenty years her senior, no doubt added to the *impasse*.'

This passage is quoted not so much in criticism of a work which obviously does not demand it, as to show how material may be thrown away. But it is really almost incredible that anybody should have stayed at Frankfort with Frau Schumann for three weeks, receiving a daily lesson in the singing of Schumann's *Lieder*, and should be content to record this in a few dry sentences conveying not the slightest impression of the experience or of Frau Schumann's personality to the reader. Yet Liza Lehmann achieved this incredible feat, her only lively observation being that of Brahms, whose 'bluff and coarse manners' made her shrink into her shell, and who 'when one morning at breakfast 'he gobbled up a whole tin of sardines and made assurance 'doubly sure by drinking the oil from the tin at a draught,' finished *her* off as well as the sardines.

Though the test of autobiography is the observation of self rather than that of others, the former inevitably includes the latter, and appositely enough Miss Ethel Smyth, whose autobiographical faculty is extraordinary, enables us to gauge the unreceptivity of a Liza Lehmann by the vigour and life with which the same two characters, Brahms and Frau Schumann, stand out in her illumination. To her Brahms was unsympathetic, and she does not hesitate to say so; but, as the artist that she is in all her presentations of other people, she gives in a few pages an impression, brief but finished, of Brahms the whole man, with qualities pleasant and unpleasant.

'To see him with Lili Wach, Frau Schumann and her daughters, or other links with his great predecessors was to see him at his best, so gentle and respectful was his bearing; in fact to Frau Schumann he behaved as might a particularly delightful old-world son. . . .

'His ways with other women-folk—or to use the detestable word for ever on his lips, "Weibsbilder"—were less admirable. If they did not appeal to him he was incredibly awkward and ungracious; if they were pretty he had an unpleasant way of leaning back in his chair, pouting out his lips, stroking his moustache, and staring at them as a greedy boy stares at jam tartlets. . . .

'I like best to think of Brahms at the piano, playing his own compositions or Bach's mighty organ fugues, sometimes accompanying himself with a sort of muffled roar, as of Titans stirred to sympathy in the bowels of the earth. The veins in his forehead stood out, his

wonderful bright blue eyes became veiled, and he seemed the incarnation of the restrained power in which his own work is forged. . . .

'I saw integrity, sincerity, kindness of heart, generosity to opponents, and a certain nobility of soul that stamps all his music; but on the other hand, I saw coarseness, uncivilisedness, a defective perception of subtle shades in people and things, lack of humour, and of course the inevitable and righteous selfishness of people who have a message of their own to deliver and can't run errands for others.'

That is the true penetration, the sympathy of the artist which transcends the antipathies of the individual and mercifully drowns poor little tins of sardines and little people who shrink into their shells. Miss Smyth only stayed a day or two with Frau Schumann at Frankfort, but every detail of the visit fixed itself indelibly in her memory, and the two letters which she then wrote to her mother reflect with no little vivacity the charm of that interior.

Ella Wheeler Wilcox, like Liza Lehmann, did not long survive the publication of her reminiscences. Her book is in many ways as artless as that of Liza Lehmann, but it has two great advantages: its author had some knowledge of the use of language and was endowed with a character of unusual determination. Of her work as a poet it is not imperative to speak, except to quote the words which Mr. Edmund Gosse once wrote of Philip James Bailey, the author of 'Festus':—

'There was nothing in his work to attract students of what is exquisitely put, and as a rule he has been little appreciated by these rarer spirits. His form is so plain as to be negligible; it is his matter, in his ethical attitude, that is found attractive by those—and they are numerous—who in several generations have come under his spell. "Festus" appeals to the non-literary temperament, which is something very different indeed from saying that it appeals to the anti-literary. . . . No purely æsthetic estimate of the poem will satisfy those who reply, "Yes, what you say is technically true, no doubt; but it has helped and comforted me, and it helps me still." In many a distant home, in America even oftener than Great Britain, a visit to some invalid's room would reveal the presence of two volumes on the bed, the one a Bible, the other "Festus."'

These words might be applied with great exactitude to an edition of the works of this popular poet of America, whose wrapping of a strong ethical attitude in reasonable verse has comforted many if it has charmed few. 'To be a gifted poet is 'a glory; to be a worth-while woman is a greater glory' is an

apophthegm contained in her autobiography. She makes it plain that she conceived herself to be both, but she takes her poetic achievements so complacently for granted that she does not trouble to insist on them; her allusions to them are even surprisingly casual, as of a journeyman to his daily toil.

With a more usual type of vanity—for she was vain enough in her own way—and a greater sense of humour, she would hardly have recorded how she rose one morning at seven o'clock and, seating herself wrapped in an eiderdown beside the feeble gas fire of a London hotel, produced the verses on the Queen's funeral punctually by nine o'clock for her anxiously waiting editor. There is a certain comic incongruity, too, when on the memory of a pleasant ball follow the words:—

> 'Dancing and music have always stirred my muse to action; so the morning after the ball I wrote the verses called "A Dirge," beginning:
>
> 'Death and a dirge at midnight,
> Yet never a soul in the house
> Heard anything more than the throb and the beat
> Of a beautiful waltz of Strauss.'

But if the latter parts of 'The Worlds and I' are unimportant, and the final chapters only of interest to spiritualists, the earlier chapters definitely reveal a personality. Ella Wheeler Wilcox had a defective imagination which, applied to her own personality, only enabled her to focus it in part. In the period of girlhood and the first fierce struggle to emerge from obscurity she stood out prominently to herself as a lively figure which faded away in a mist of marriage, happiness, and success. The reader experiences the fluctuations of this image: the intense interest with which he follows a genuine piece of autobiography vanishes into indifference as he attends the globe-trottings of a strictly limited mind.

Here the difference between autobiography and idle jotting is illustrated in one book. The former, though imperfect, is worth attention, for it explains Ella Wheeler Wilcox, her work and her success. Typically American, of New England blood, though born to a thoroughly western environment, she was brought into the world at a point of all conceivable remoteness from conditions likely to encourage art and poetry. Her father, once a teacher of the violin, dancing, and deportment, was seeking his fortune unsuccessfully on a farm in Wisconsin.

Life was a continual round of drudgery and struggle for all the family, money was always short and tempers failed under the strain.

'There was continual worry at home. No one was resigned or philosophical. My mother hated her hard-working lot for which she was totally unfitted, and constantly rebelled against it like a caged animal beating against iron bars, while she did her distasteful tasks with a Spartan-like adherence to duty, doubting the dominance of an all-wise ruler who could condemn her to such a lot. . . . The home was pervaded by an atmosphere of discontent and fatigue and irritability.'

Strong natures are not foiled by such conditions, and Ella Wheeler was strong. She greeted every new day, as she tells us, with a song on her lips, and hope, firm but unreasonable, in her heart. 'A peculiar spiritual egotism,' she says, led her to look for special dispensations of Providence in her behalf. This peculiar spiritual egotism is the clue to all that is most solid and individual in her personality; her revelation of it constitutes all that is of value in her record. Her desires were keen, her will unconquerable: by sheer persistence she forced her way out of obscurity and poverty, always unaided and independent. Her parents made great sacrifices to send her to Madison University, but after one term she insisted on coming home. It did not suit her opinionated talent and so, casting away the opportunities of education, she returned at once to form it for herself in solitude, disfigured though it was by penury and domestic irritation.

When she was fourteen, an aunt who subscribed to the New York *Mercury* departed, taking her subscription with her. The persistent spirit was called to action. She began to contribute essays to the paper which she wanted, thus earning a free subscription. From that moment she carried on the attack without relaxation; often repulsed, often (for an hour) discouraged, she pounded away at editorial citadels, to use her own phrase, till they opened. Periodicals, pictures, bric-à-brac, and table-ware poured into the bare homestead as a reward, and neighbours who criticised her parents for allowing her to keep out of the kitchen and scribble grew to respect her talent when one day's work at her desk enabled her to hire an assistant in the house for a month. Success thus won by persistence from adversity

strengthens the character, but hardens it too. It coated this character with a steely complacency that nothing could penetrate, repelling every arrow from without, compressing all modesty within. The degree of this compression may be measured by her allusion to a lost correspondence with James Whitcomb Riley, the poet.

'It is a veritable loss to literature that this spirited and sparkling series of letters which were exchanged no longer exists. . . . The wit and sparkle and beauty and pathos of his letters and my replies would, I know, have been delightful reading for the world to-day. . . .'

Marriage, awaited, as she tells us, with agreeable expectancy, came to her as early as success. Her record of these happy events is the climax of her autobiographical achievement. Thereafter, except for the unconscious humour of her extravagant eulogies of female friends—those young women of 'unusual beauty and brains and moral worth,' such as the Helen who was 'a skilful harpist, a linguist, and a combination of 'Mesdames Recamier and De Stael,' or the Julie to talk with whom over the telephone gave her 'a sense of larger horizons'—the interest is extinguished. Her armour was complete, and it included a visor which seriously hampered her vision.

Miss Ethel Smyth's autobiography has already been welcomed by the discriminating with the warm recognition that it so thoroughly deserves, but it is worth while to insist here particularly that its value as a work of art lies not in the lively touches and portraits which give it an immediate contemporary interest, but in the fact that it is a great autobiography written by a woman, the first perhaps in the English language. Miss Smyth records in her introduction that she began this book simply as a memory of early childhood—a proof of the way in which artistic power catches hold of the artist's intentions and drags them up to its own high level. The theme of early childhood accounts for some irrelevances which could have been spared, but it is soon refined away, leaving the true and only purpose of a biography to proceed unhindered to a triumphant conclusion. Rousseau's aim was to show himself as he was, bating nothing: Miss Ethel Smyth's is the same. Small minds would not even formulate such a purpose, though a want of power to carry it out might be conceived in a mind large enough

to conceive it. Where power and purpose go together in autobiography, the quality of the result is bound to be remarkable.

This rare and unmistakable quality crowns Miss Ethel Smyth's first pursuit of art in literature, and it is the more remarkable since the musical art has usually been exclusive of the literary. Berlioz is one of the few composers who has made any literary achievement of his own life. Music has been throughout the profession of Miss Smyth, yet, as a writer, she seems to have all that is essential—imagination, insight, humour, power to delineate others, a delicate sense of language, and, above all, self-penetration. Had Mrs. Carlyle or Charlotte Brontë written their own lives, nothing more could have been expected from them than she has achieved. Further, if she has the essentials in her, she has also the imagination to see and to reproduce them. She shows again how little of a personality can be observed above the surface; that events, acquaintances, external circumstances, are as unimportant as clothes; and that the vision that combined them, and their effect on that one vision, are the important things.

At the same time, this book is an effective criticism of those who, like Miss Dorothy Richardson and Miss May Sinclair, pretend in their pseudo-autobiographical novels that no treasures or truths are to be found except at the most recondite levels of self-consciousness. Miss Smyth takes in the whole range, selecting the essentials for a penetrating portrait as easily as Mr. Sargent has done in the sketch of her which she reproduces. Mr. Sargent has been no more kind to her than she has been to herself, and it says much for the unity of acute artistic perceptions that the two portraits correspond most intimately. The hungry face with its open mouth, staring with wide eyes at coveted horizons, is a perfect commentary on what its real counterpart is not ashamed to reveal. Miss Smyth admits it when she recollects a childish incident in which 'all uncon-
'sciously a life's philosophy was formulated.' On being helped judiciously to a favourite pudding she refused to touch it, and answered her grandmother's inquiry by the significant words:—
'Yes, but this is so little I can't eat it.'

It is one thing for a woman to publish her autobiography in her life-time and another to comment on it. Delicacy—though the author might freely excuse it—intrudes, especially when

tragedy, forgotten or sublimated by time though it be, is present. Nevertheless, it would be foolish to be too chary in accepting what Miss Ethel Smyth has given us, since she after all assumes the chief responsibility for the gift. Here again was one who, like Ella Wheeler Wilcox, had to struggle with circumstances for the realisation of her artistic self. Poverty and obscurity were not her foes; it was against family tradition and the will of her father that she had to struggle. She struggled ruthlessly with all the persistence of the American girl on the Wisconsin farm, but there was none of Ella Wheeler Wilcox's moral earnestness in the struggle. To her it was everything to be a gifted musician, let others be 'worth-while women' if they would. She was the incarnation of a passionate temperament, devoid of any Puritan strain, grasping eagerly where her desires pointed, and raging furiously when her grasp was eluded.

She well earned in early days the nickname of the 'Stormy ' Petrel,' and the gathering and bursting of the great storm which she survived is what gives its dramatic unity to the book. It knits together into a coherent whole much that is purely enjoyable for its own sake, though not essentially autobiographical—portraits of friends, humorous reflections, letters of surprising vivacity and feeling. These amenities draw the reader onward unresisting from page to page, but they must not encroach on the limited space at the disposal of a commentator. He must confine himself to the portrait of the artist which gives value to all the rest.

'Ambitious, wilful, torn by storms of anger, despair, and love, feeling that somehow I was of different stuff to the boys and girls I associated with, and had that in me that not even my mother, who loved me dearly and knew me so well in some ways, ever suspected, there was no one to help me into the path I afterwards found for myself with so much difficulty.'

The gifts that life might offer to such a girl would plainly not be won without much suffering. The resistance to be overcome was not only that of a passionate, immature temperament, apt to be distracted from its main purpose by other pleasant ambitions and enjoyments—it was that of other wills, notably the will of her father, the retired and gallant soldier who, keeping himself with inflexible simplicity to the path which he conceived to be right, found it intolerable that his family should wish to

diverge. The personalities of the father and mother stand before us with a brightness only challenged by that of the author's own—a brightness of affectionate sympathy, for hardly as they tried her the bond of love was strong and mutual.

Of her mother, a woman of Gallic brilliance not entirely at home in a Victorian *milieu*, witty but not always winning, and envious of those who won by kindliness, quick to take umbrage at imaginary slights, generous but extravagant, tortured by a physical infirmity borne bravely but rebelliously, Miss Ethel Smyth never omits to record the salient virtue: 'As I am never 'tired of saying, at the worst moments her bigness of soul came 'into play—then she never failed us.' To her mother's bigness of soul—though for them to live together bred inevitable and unbearable storms—the girl, aided by her own ruthlessness, owed her emancipation. At her demand to go to Leipzig her father might furiously exclaim: 'I would sooner see you under 'the sod,' or with his boot almost burst the panel of his wayward daughter's locked bedroom door. Yet resistance was made impossible for him, not only by Miss Smyth's financial dealings with the local postman, but by the tacit antagonism of his less limited wife. A respectable home was found in Leipzig, an escort provided, there was indeed nothing for it but to capitulate.

Here the drama moves for a time into an atmosphere of joy and sunlight after the mists and mutterings of the early struggle. The freed but eager spirit plunged headlong into all that was precious in an older musical Germany. Seven happy years left indelible images on a receptive soul. The free outlet in music under ideal conditions of a precocious talent, the untrammelled life, the more than warm welcome by those whom she honoured, the expansion under genial influences of all that had been compressed, strengthened and matured a vigorous character without perhaps correcting its acerbity. So much still called imperatively to be grasped: the pudding was still too small.

The fates were at hand. They used in retribution the brightest gift of all these happy years, the passionate friendship with Frau von Herzogenberg, compelling tragic circumstance to break it in her hand. The greatness of this gift and the measure of its loss can only be gathered from Miss Smyth's own words. After a climax of all felicity, the visit of her mother to Leipzig in April 1885, during which she was made happy by all abund-

ance of hospitality and appreciation, the blow fell, prepared it is true, but unsuspected.

Of its cause Miss Smyth writes calmly, faithfully, if with a necessary reticence. It would be unbecoming to do more than acknowledge our rather painful sense of intrusion into a delicate affair and to recognise the artistic restraint of its quite convincing presentation. The blow was all the harder for falling in absence. The friendship was broken by letter, written by one who had, as we are able to judge, made her correspondence the medium for an almost ecstatic affection. The hardy spirit was now, to use her own words, 'in the desert,' wherein she painfully walked till, having learned much, she reached a less arid country. For some years the gloom gathered instead of lightening; longing for the past and passionate protest at the rupture, filled the days with bitterness. The image of Lisl rose sadly before her.

> 'Lisl . . . had a very characteristic way of holding her head a little on one side and nodding gently as she spoke. . . . All down these later years nothing had given me more pain than the way some flowers nod . . . or again, sometimes walking down a road at dusk, my mind on music and all else forgotten, a tree top would suddenly bend towards me with the old familiar gesture and wring my heart as if put there on purpose to do it.'

Fate wafted her, with this gnawing regret in her heart, to Munich, where the worst of the storm-cloud burst over her to bring serenity in its wake. Miss Smyth will never put misery more effectively into music than she has into prose. The break-down at Munich, with its strange sequel of a purely temporary repose on the bosom of Christian belief, is with all its simplicity the supreme passage. The author passes out of it, and soon afterwards out of the book to the chastened fulfilment of her artistic, and as she hints her emotional, life whither she does not invite us to follow her. May she yet move us as deeply with the tones of a composer as she has with the words of a complete autobiographer.

ORLO WILLIAMS.

THE NOVELS OF JOSEPH CONRAD

1. **Almayer's Folly.** Second Impression. Unwin. 1907. First published, 1895.
2. **An Outcast of the Islands.** Fourth Impression. Unwin. 1919. First published, 1896.
3. **The Nigger of the *Narcissus*.** Popular Edition. Heinemann. 1919. First published, 1897.
4. **Tales of Unrest.** Second Impression. Unwin. 1909. First published, 1898.
5. **Lord Jim.** Popular Edition. Blackwood. 1919. First published, 1900.
6. **Youth.** Popular Edition. Blackwood. 1919. First published, 1902.
7. **Typhoon.** Popular Edition. Heinemann. 1919. First published, 1903.
8. **Nostromo.** Second Impression. Harper. 1905. First published, 1903.
9. **The Secret Agent.** Ninth Edition. Methuen. 1919. First published, 1907.
10. **Victory.** Sixth Edition. Methuen. 1919. First published, 1915.
11. **The Arrow of Gold.** Unwin. First published, 1919.
12. **The Mirror of the Sea.** Seventh Edition. Methuen. 1917. First published, 1906.
13. **A Personal Record.** Nelson. 1919. First published under the title, "Some Reminiscences." Eveleigh Nash. 1912.
14. **Joseph Conrad.** By RICHARD CURLE. Kegan Paul. 1914.
15. **Romance.** By JOSEPH CONRAD and FORD MADOX HUEFFER. Nelson. 1903.

> '*Il existe, en un mot, chez les trois quarts des hommes*
> *Un poète mort jeune, à qui l'homme survit.*'

THIS verse, which Musset, with all grace of acknowledgment, lifted bodily from the prose of Sainte Beuve, sets out a truth that lies at the heart of Mr. Conrad's work. He is, fundamentally, a novelist concerned with the imaginative faculty in man; that faculty which (especially in youth, as Sainte

---

Footnote.—The books mentioned in this review are only those which the reviewer has been able to procure at the time of writing without recourse to libraries or second-hand stalls. Two volumes of short stories and two novels are thus omitted. Where there was so much to be said, it seemed impossible to attempt a study of the two novels in which Mr. Ford Madox Hueffer was a collaborator with Mr. Conrad—the result being quite unlike Mr. Conrad's single-handed work, though such a figure as Tomas Castro in that most picturesque novel, "Romance," is plainly one of his creations.

Beuve noted) makes every man something of a poet, building fancies, shaping pictures, scenes, adventures of which the centre is the dreamer's own imagined or idealised personality. And although generally this is a phase which passes and leaves no trace perceptible, still most men have been dreamers, and some remain castle builders always. It is, I think, true to say that Mr. Conrad's concern is chiefly with those who have retained the castle-building habit, or else (like himself) have followed their dream till at last imagination and reality to some extent grew one.

There must always be, in an art which depends so much on observation as the prose novel, close relation between the artist's own life and the chosen material of his imagination. Thus Thackeray is solidly based in clubland, while Dickens, a waif himself, deals with the flotsam and jetsam of humanity. Nearly all Mr. Conrad's fiction is concerned with the life of people separated by choice or chance from their native surroundings. Europeans in Malay States—Europeans in Africa—Europeans in an imaginary South American republic—Englishmen and Americans gun-running in the Mediterranean—conspirators of all nationalities plotting together in London—these categories cover nearly everything, with one great exception. Normal life for Mr. Conrad, the life of his proper country, is on the sea ; his home is the ship ; he writes of the ship as Trollope wrote of the Government Office. For almost every man the sea is an adventure. It is the career to which imagination has always drawn youth out of the ring fence of landsmen's use and wont—though seldom indeed with so far a call as reached Mr. Conrad in the heart of a people where not one in a thousand could ever have even beheld salt water from the shore. It is the amazing outcome of Mr. Conrad's boyish dreams that a Pole should have interpreted the sea to Englishmen as no Englishman had ever done before. But in the sea's life to which men are so often drawn by imagination, each adventurer soon finds himself biting into the tough core of reality—and men learn there, living constantly in the presence of danger, that imagination may be the deadliest danger of all, affecting not a man's life, but his worth as a man.

Student of the imaginative that he is, Mr. Conrad is concerned with all aspects of this faculty, its power to prompt

action, its power to inhibit, its ignoble no less than its high employment. In the very interesting pages of autobiography, which are now published as 'A Personal Record,' he notes that in his writings he has constantly laid stress on the quality of fidelity, the first condition of good service. It is, as he says, 'a very simple idea,' yet being a matter of instinct rather than reason, it cannot be very easily defined—at least, in his sense of it, which certainly means something very different from the punctual discharge of specified obligations. Fidelity with him lies in what is beyond the range of any bargaining; it is loyalty to the unwritten tradition, to a moral code upon which geography has no bearing, but is as universal as the sea. This fidelity is what interests him perhaps, because it is the curb on imagination, because it is the law from which no adventurer can escape, even if, following the desire of his mind, he has reached to places where neither the social nor the legal sanctions of his own country can help or hinder him. Men may break this law, but they cannot break it unknowingly; and Mr. Conrad is interested in those who break it as in those who hold fast. And perhaps the reason why this born seaman—with a vocation for his craft so strong that it dragged him out of the heart of Poland, defying all grip of use and wont—has written comparatively few stories of life on shipboard is to be found in the fact that the sea's life is closely ordered and regulated, with its own law indisputably understood. The themes that attract him are situations where men are flung back on their own natures for guidance, and where, in the lack of conventional restraints, qualities develop to the full. Not necessarily rare qualities; the scenes which he sets up are strange to us, the scope of passions displayed is strange, yet we recognise as often as not commonplace everyday types, blossoming now into heroism, now into *fleurs de mal.*

Take the first of his novels, which began to be written while he still followed the sea, though it was finished only after he and the life of ships had parted company for ever. Twenty years, from fifteen to thirty-five, he had given to that way of being, and during the last four of them this novel was being composed in stray periods of leisure and in many places. Its scene was laid among those Eastern island countries which of all regions had said strongest hold of his imagination. The call of the sea to

him had been not simply for itself—it was part of the adventure which must take him to unknown lands of which he had dreamed over a map as a boy. In one most unforgettable and enchanting story, 'Youth,' he has described the drawing of that lure of the East and the magic of first vision of the East. But in 'Almayer's 'Folly,' an eastern background is painted with design rather to give the full effect of its oppressive loneliness overhanging the European alien. Almayer is not the man who has followed his imagination. He is one of the thousand who in the normal conditions of their race become clerks, less or more efficient; but he has been born and bred in the East, son of a petty official in Java; his natural environment is the European settlement, and outside of it no desire of his own takes him. He is lifted out of it by the will, almost by the caprice, of a true sea rover, Captain Lingard, the Rajah Laut (King of the Sea), as Malays have named him, and is chosen by Lingard to be the husband of his adopted daughter, a Malay girl, captured in a fight with pirates. It is Lingard's imagination in act, Lingard's persistent will to express his own power, that instals Almayer with the Malay wife as Lingard's representative on the river in Borneo to which no other trader can gain access. It is true that imagination has been lit up also in the young clerk, but only in the rudimentary form of visioned gold. All Lingard's wealth is promised in inheritance to Almayer and to the children of this marriage; and the inheritance is to be enormous, for Lingard dreams of treasure also, but of treasure to be won by his own daring, his own mastery of men. That vision however the Rajah Laut does not realise, and the moderate wealth which he had amassed in his romantic trade vanishes in a banker's failure. In time he himself vanishes also, defeated in his quest, and leaves Almayer still under the obsession of his long nurtured dream of piled up guilders and of triumphant departure from the detested aliendom, and triumphal entry into the civilisation of Amsterdam—with his daughter on his arm.

For Almayer's imaginings of wealth have this distinction: they are bound up with a passion not wholly selfish. Futile, helpless, overmatched by the cunning and the wealth of Arab traders, he has been the slave of a mere castle-building mania. Imagination, his enemy, has kept him lingering superfluous on a scene where there is no longer any place for him, still drugging

his inaction with that dream of rich alluvial gold up the river which drove Lingard into desperate adventure. The only interest in Almayer's dreaming springs from the fact that another than himself is the centre of his fancy's picture; it is for his daughter that he desires the treasure, his daughter whom he longs to remove from the savagery made loathsome to him, above all, by hourly contact with his Malay wife.

Mr. Conrad makes us feel however that this dreamer loves his dream more than his daughter; his love for her is shattered utterly when she, on the call of her nature, going to the arms of a Malay chief, destroys in its very principle the picture built about her image. He cuts away the one creature that gives value to his life, because she is false, not to him but to his dream.

Reticent from the first, the artist presents without comment the splendour, the beauty, the daring, the manhood of the young Malay chief and the squalor, the impotence, of the seedy and bankrupt European; the irony is implicit, not expressed. Here he has rendered in the earliest of his love scenes the call to Nina Almayer of her Malay blood—and the white man's repulsion at this willing step downwards. In the next book, 'An 'Outcast of the Islands,' he was to show attraction and repulsion in the same breast—the double effect of primitive savage womanhood on an average civilised white man. Willems, the outcast, another clerk of old Hudig, another favourite of Lingard's, is more of a man than Almayer, but he has worse flaws in him; capable of action he is incapable of restraint; and he has forfeited success by a failure in honesty. Lingard fetches him to his secret river that he may be out of the way for a while; and in idleness there the big young Dutchman meets the Malay girl Aïssa—daughter of an old blinded pirate chief. Mr. Conrad can feel and render sexual passion as Englishmen do not and cannot. Causes of the instinctive choice which has made him an Englishman may perhaps be traced in his austerity to what, unlike an Englishman, he can realise—that whirlwind of passion in which the Latin races at all events find something to admire. After a passage of amazing beauty he stigmatises the ecstasy to which Willems has attained in words that have a ring of Dante: it is 'a delirious 'peace, a happiness that is infamous, cowardly, and so exquisite 'that the debased mind refuses to contemplate its termination;

'for to the victims of such happiness, the moment of its ceasing 'is the beginning afresh of that torture which is its price.'

With Willems this torture passes, only to be replaced by the sickness of a revulsion as extreme as the intoxication. To hold the girl, he has betrayed his benefactor, giving up to Lingard's Arab rival the secret of Lingard's pilotage in the channel; yet the disgrace which makes him loathsome in his own eyes comes, not from this supreme betrayal of fidelity, but in his sense that he, a white man, has been contaminated, dragged down to the level of a savage; and the very excess of Aïssa's passion for himself fills him with horror. He feels for himself the contempt that other white men—Almayer, Lingard even—will feel for her:

'that illogical impulse of disapproval, which is half disgust, half vague fear, and that wakes up in our hearts in the presence of anything new or unusual, or anything that is not run into the mould of our own conscience; the accursed feeling made up of disdain, of anger, and of the sense of superior virtue that leaves us deaf, blind, contemptuous, and stupid before anything which is not like ourselves.' *

There is evident in all these books Mr. Conrad's partisanship for the weaker race whose beauty, whose charm, whose chivalry have so wrought upon his imagination. He is indignant (though the indignation is conveyed only in tone) because to white men in the East, native life is, as he puts it in 'Lord Jim,' no more than 'a play of shadows.' Many of his Malay portraits—the girl Aïssa, Dain the lover of Almayer's daughter, old Doramin in 'Lord Jim,' Karain, and the central figure of another wonderful short story, 'The Lagoon,' are more decorative than any of his European studies. But they are generalised; seen from without, as Scott presented his Highlanders, types rather than individuals. Aïssa is merely primitive woman in love, with her passion complicated because she loves out of her own race. Mr. Conrad's fancy dwells on these Malays with delight, but he recognises them as acting by a law of their own; if there be subtleties of interpretation in that law, he does not profess to follow them. But his imagination tells him that on the borderline of colour there must come trouble and searchings of heart when the traditions of the coloured race are challenged by the white man's influence and example. So Karain finds himself torn between

* 'An Outcast of the Islands,' p. 268.

the traditional loyalty which has joined him to his war comrade in a quest, and a new feeling for that comrade's sister, whom her brother seeks to slay because she has broken away from tradition to follow her European lover.

The clash and struggle between East and West is not again portrayed so emphatically as in 'Almayer's Folly' and its successor; for Mr. Conrad's art abhors emphasis and subtilises to excess. These two first books are naturally less entirely characteristic than the others, though none the less worth critical study for that. Technically, it is curious to reflect that one of them is a sequel to the other and the sequel comes first. Mr. Conrad has often chosen to spin his web backwards. Again and again he begins by presenting a scene with a group of characters fully realised in some significant relation; and then, as if you and he had met this scene on landing at some port, he will hark back to get you informed who they were, how they came there, dramatising their past as he has dramatised their present, and then—it may be half way through the book—will take up again where he began, and carry the story to its close. This tendency, manifest to some extent in his first book, displays itself to an extraordinary degree in his most elaborate and ambitious work, 'Nostromo.' And although 'Lord Jim,' which Mr. Curle, in the most extended study of Mr. Conrad's art yet published, holds to be the most popular of his novels, begins at the beginning and goes smoothly forward for a while, there comes an abrupt break in the narrative with the bump to the *Patna's* keel. We leap over a vast train of incident, through all of which we are led later on, deviously, as it seems, and as often backward as forward, though with the result that every detail of it becomes vividly present to us. If we had been told at once that Malay seamen stayed at the helm when the European officers deserted the ship, that fact would not have the supreme significance which it acquires by being withheld—and then, how dramatically heightened by the old Serang's confidence that the white men, because they were white men, had good reason for what they did, and did what was best for the ship. Again, in the second part of the story, which tells how Jim retrieved himself, we learn the issue of his fate long before we reach the recital of how it came to pass. Mr. Conrad's story seems often elicited rather than volunteered—sometimes to be positively dragged out of

him. The truth is of course that he does not want you to be interested—he is not interested himself—in what happened, but in how it happened, and why it happened. Imagination, as he says in his 'Personal Record,' is the master faculty—not invention. So long as he can make you realise the colour and quality of events, he is quite willing that you should foreknow their trend.

There are however a group of his stories to which this description of his involved method does not apply—the stories of ships and seamen. 'Youth,' 'Typhoon,' 'The Nigger of the '*Narcissus*,' are as direct as sailing orders. It is as if a simpler technique were demanded of him by the type which he depicted. Here are no cross-currents of race—for, so far as I can judge, the complications on board of the *Narcissus* arise because James Wait is a malingerer not because he is a St. Kitts negro. The psychology of these stories is the psychology of ordinary men under extraordinary but quite simple stress—extraordinary fatigue, extraordinary danger, from tempest, from fire. Yet in 'Typhoon' (possibly the best of the three, if one had to choose among three of the best stories that ever were written in any language) there is a complication connected with race difference, though the essence of the story is to develop Mr. Conrad's characteristic view of human nature. Captain MacWhirr, of the steamship *Nan Shan*, is a stupid man. One feels that he is the seaman who, born in a seafaring community, in following the sea has followed a groove. He assuredly is one to whom Mr. Conrad's observation applies that the ordinary seaman is no wanderer but lives an almost sedentary life, constantly at home on his ship, caring little to leave it 'for to admire and for to see' when it takes him to some alien region. In Captain MacWhirr this lack of imagination is carried to excess. He has no ideas, no conversation. Nothing interrupts the punctual discharge of his duty. He does not wait to bid the devil good-morrow when he meets him; he never thinks about the devil's existence. When the barometer confronts him with startling symptoms, he recognises that there is 'dirt about,' but he takes no steps to avoid it. Mr. Conrad seems to suggest that there is a storm strategy by which a more gifted seaman might have escaped the worst of the coming trouble; but Captain MacWhirr goes straight ahead, like a traditional officer of the traditional regular army.

His mate, Jukes, has more imagination, or less lack of imagination—but so far as the storm is concerned, the relations of these two are normal; the courageous young sailor gathers confidence from the presence of his courageous captain.

Complication arises when, along with the almost certain prospect of going down with all hands, Captain MacWhirr and his officer have to deal with another danger. They are carrying two hundred Chinese, and in the very blackest and wildest of the storm the boatswain crawls up with news that these coolies are fighting like madmen in the between decks. Captain MacWhirr immediately tells Jukes that he is to 'go and stop it.' He does not say how it is to be done; his imagination does not present it as a risk to be faced. He imagines nothing about it; all he knows is that fighting is improper on board a ship which he commands, and doubly improper at such a time. Jukes, on his part, imagines easily enough the difficulty and the danger, and is furious at being asked to take on such a job when it is so hard barely to keep alive. Still protesting, he makes his way below, and sees what has happened. All the wooden boxes in which the Chinese carry their belongings have broken loose and become matchwood; the decks are littered with their hardly gained dollars; the coolies, grabbing after loose silver, and pitched from side to side by the tossing vessel, are tangled together in one struggling mass. Jukes has to induce his own men to follow him into this chaos. With his half-dozen seamen, he herds the coolies back into a corner and ropes them in. His European handful of sailors then clear the decks, gathering up the dollars and carrying them away, under the eyes of this crazy mob. Jukes then reports to his captain, who shows no inkling of what peril his order has involved. All this passes while they weather out the typhoon.

Characteristically, most skilfully, Mr. Conrad having created his picture of the appalling first period of the hurricane, creates also a sense of the captain's knowledge that a pause will come before the very worst; he gets you to the pause, leaves you wondering how much more of this description you can stand —and then quite suddenly breaks it off. He has told you enough; you can take the rest for granted—so far as the storm goes. The affair of the coolies is completed casually, as if in a postscript. Jukes, it has been seen, was dissatisfied because his captain did not seem to know what he was asking of his officer

when he told him to stop the fight, nor to realise the detail of what he had accomplished. But afterwards—was it stupidity, or was MacWhirr a hero? Everybody else on board was for handing over the gathered dollars to Chinese officials in the port of repatriation, and leaving to them the task of apportionment. Captain MacWhirr's view was however that on this plan very few of the dollars would get to the Chinamen, and he proposed to distribute the money himself. The imagination of every one else on board pictured a dangerous riot with these aliens, and Jukes, hearing that the captain had called the coolies on deck, rushed for rifles and a bodyguard—only to be ordered by MacWhirr to stop such antics and let business go on; as accordingly it did, and the man who anticipated no trouble found none: the Chinese, whose unreasoning fury Jukes had imagined, quietly accepting the European's blunt decision to dismiss all individual claims and divide the whole amount equally, head for head. In all this matter-of-fact, stolid, imperturbable combination of fidelity and courage, the lack of imagination is plainly indicated as a source of strength. Yet I do not think Mr. Conrad would go beyond saying that such a man as MacWhirr might be the ideal captain of a steamship. The heroes of his own craft (for Mr. Conrad's service to the sea was all on sailing vessels), commanders of winged and almost sentient creatures, must be of a less insensitive type. The captain of the *Narcissus* has nothing in common with MacWhirr, except indeed that both are Scots; and the difference in the two men's relation to their storm-beaten ships is the difference between poetry and prose.

'Youth' is a poem, but of a less dramatic type, for the ship round which it centres is as unpoetic as a ship can be. It is the idyll of a young seaman's first great adventure at sea, made dramatically complete in that he not only reaches the dreamed-of East, but reaches it in charge of his first independent command, steering the smallest of three boats which escaped from the burning *Judea—London—Do or Die*. Here again fidelity is in the essence of the theme—a fidelity which goes beyond all covenants, and disregards life in comparison of a scruple. The old skipper refuses the chance that offers him escape from a fast-burning ship; he must hang on while the last imaginable possibility remains of getting her into port; and the crew, whose lives are at stake, faithful to the conditions of their service,

accept his word without a murmur. When he is driven to the boats, he insists on salving for the underwriters whatever can conceivably be brought away, and even then, two hundred miles from land, he will not put sail on the boats until the ship has finally gone down. Mr. Conrad has done nothing more pathetic than the figure of this old man—indeed, of this old couple, for his wife, briefly sketched in at the opening, becomes an indissoluble part of our conception of him.

It would be hard to name any other writer who has equalled Mr. Conrad in his power of presenting in some episode of a story a character that does not recur, and yet continues to be felt throughout the whole; emanations, as it were, radiating from it through the whole atmosphere after it has been withdrawn. The extreme instance is that of the French lieutenant in 'Lord Jim.' The *Patna*, on a still night, beating her way quietly through a glassy sea, had struck and passed over some derelict floating half-submerged, stoving her bows in, and leaving nothing but one bulkhead, a thin plate of rusty iron, to keep out the ocean; the shameless skipper and his equal consorts the engineers had launched a boat and left her, doomed at any instant to go down with eight hundred sleeping pilgrims aboard—leaving also, because he would not join in that betrayal of all fidelity, Jim the mate, the clean-bred son of an English parsonage, upstanding, straightlooking—'one of us' as the veteran seaman Marlow, who tells the story, puts it: and finally, at the last instant, under an impulse which he only could explain, and only to himself, Jim also had jumped overboard into the boat. Yet the *Patna* still lay floating as if by a miracle; and a French gunboat came along, sighted her, boarded her, and took her in tow, stern foremost to ease the pressure on the enduring bulkhead. She did not sink, and was delivered over to the British authorities at Aden, so revealing to all the world the story of disgrace—which Jim alone of her officers faced out in court, submitting to the full ordeal of his chastisement. Marlow, who had watched his trial, who had been drawn to befriend him, who had listened in bewilderment to his attempts at reconstructing the psychology of his defeat, and who secured him a new start in life, met by chance in later years an officer of the gunboat which towed the *Patna* in. This elderly lieutenant had been in charge aboard the *Patna* for thirty hours, while on the gunboat two quarter-

masters stood by, axe in hand, ready to cut the tow rope if, as was imminently possible, the vessel in tow should go down like a stone. To this Frenchman, who had never heard the explanation of that sea mystery, Marlow told the story, as Jim had told it—not concealing his sympathetic interest; and from this seaman, not of the British navy, comes with a sort of austere compassion the final verdict. Mr. Conrad wants to put, not as before a court of justice, which is bound by rules, but as between man and man, the question, was this moral shipwreck one which might conceivably have happened to anyone? Was it, in other words, excusable? Might a man forgive himself for it? Just because he understands Englishmen in a way that no Englishman could do—because being only English by adoption he sees them from the outside—he understands that no Englishman could argue a question of courage from the standpoint of complete personal security. No Englishman would permit himself to say, as the Frenchman does quite simply and naturally, 'I who have 'given my proofs'—who have established the fact of my courage. It is a Frenchman not an Englishman who will be quite sorry for the poor young man, will not cast him out of all sympathy, but at the same time will answer decisively, 'No, this is a thing 'which I could not conceivably have done.'

At the same time Mr. Conrad's instinct tells him that the Frenchman whom he presents as the giver of this weighty verdict can carry weight only with Englishmen, if, first of all, he is fully of the seaman's craft—competent as well as brave; and, secondly, possesses a courage which has nothing flashy about it—quiet, steady, enduring valiance. In twelve small pages altogether the artist contrives to get a picture of the man he wants, which gives a far more complete impression of reality than is left by the whole bulk of many creditable novels which centre upon one personality. You know that this Frenchman has wounds, and does not speak of them; you know that like so many French fighting men his appearance is that of a civilian; you know that during the thirty hours which he spent on the *Patna* ready to signal for the ropes to be cut on the gunboat, he found himself gravely incommoded by the lack of wine with his food. And you know his premise: 'Given a certain 'combination of circumstances, fear is sure to come. Abominable 'funk (*un trac épouvantable*).' But when Marlow attempts to

construe this philosophic appraisement as indicating a lenient view of Jim's disaster, France speaks. Here, as everywhere, one cannot quote Mr. Conrad without mutilating him—except indeed by culling some of those descriptive passages that are only the background of his scene. But the play's the thing; and here are a few thoroughly characteristic lines which comprise a dramatic moment :—

'The shuffle of his feet under the table interrupted me. He drew up his heavy eyelids. Drew up, I say—no other expression can describe the steady deliberation of the act—and at last was disclosed completely to me. I was confronted by two narrow grey circlets, like two tiny steel rings around the profound blackness of the pupils. The sharp glance, coming from that massive body, gave a notion of extreme efficiency, like a razor edge on a battle axe. "Pardon," he said punctiliously. His right hand went up, and he swayed forward. "Allow me. . . . I contended that one may get on knowing very well that one's courage does not come of itself (*ne vient pas tout seul*). There's nothing much in that to get upset about. One truth the more ought not to make life impossible. . . . But the honour—the honour, monsieur! . . . The honour . . . that is real!—that is! And what life may be worth when" . . . he got on his feet with a ponderous impetuosity, as a startled ox might scramble up from the grass . . . "when the honour is gone—*ah ca! par exemple*—I can offer no opinion. I can offer no opinion—because, monsieur, I know nothing of it."'

That is surely a wonderful presentment of a representative Frenchman. Mr. Conrad is in the position of having three countries. In Poland he was born; England is the country of his adoption; but France took him when he first left his home, and France introduced him to the sea. Like European humanity, he learnt his seafaring on the Mediterranean; Marseilles was the first port he knew. And though during the six years of his sea life in which he sailed under the French flag his ultimate sea allegiance was always clear in view, still a man does not forget his first years; and in the latest of his novels, 'The Arrow of 'Gold,' his picture of a Mediterranean seaman not only gives the world assurance of a man, but of a man more complex, more finely tempered, more civilised than any British sailor whom he has drawn—a picture too, it would seem from his largely autobiographical 'Mirror of the Sea,' drawn direct from memory of the life.

With such an upbringing, Mr. Conrad, though he has adopted so fully and with such clear comprehension the British tradition of

conduct, was necessarily protected from the traditional insularity. He remains not cosmopolitan but European ; one of the best international interpreters, though much too good a European to profess any colourless impartiality. His 'Personal Record' makes a temperate protest against the assumptions which underlie some criticisms that have discovered a Slavonic temperament in his work. Certainly he has known Russia from early infancy, but known it as a Pole ; as a young child he accompanied his father into Siberian exile ; and the only portrait of a Russian that I recall in his writings is that of the Secretary to the Embassy in 'The Secret Agent,' who tells Verloc that a dynamite explosion is wanted, and must be produced. It is a vivid picture, inspired by the feelings which one expects from a Polish Nationalist. But there is another race towards which Mr. Conrad as a Pole must have special hereditary feelings ; and for an uncompromising study of a German at the worst it would be hard to beat the hotel keeper, Schomberg, who makes a transient appearance in 'Lord Jim,' but is fully presented in a much later novel, 'Victory.' Yet Mr. Conrad is far from lumping all Germans in a common condemnation. If Schomberg is mean, brutal, and bullying, cowardly under a veneer of virility, and is all these disagreeable things in a specially German way, on the other hand Stein, in 'Lord Jim,' the old merchant adventurer, scientist, and lover, is German to the core of his being. It should be added however that he came of Bavarian stock, and fled his country because he was a rebel in 1848. He is none the less German for that, and in all Mr. Conrad's gallery there is no more attractive figure. He too is presented in a few pages which by themselves make a masterpiece. 'Lord Jim' as a whole does not reach the level of these two inset pictures. Stein however does not go out of the story like the nameless French lieutenant ; he also passes his verdict, but it is a diagnosis. Jim is 'a romantic'—one who lives too much by the imagination ; and Stein can conceive of Jim's yet making good in a world where nothing can break in to destroy his concept of himself—away from all voices which remind him of the *Patna* and of the ineradicable distrust in him felt by his own kind, by Marlow even. And so Jim gets his chance, from Stein.

If Mr. Curle may be taken as representative, fervent admirers

of Mr. Conrad's work incline to resent 'Lord Jim's' special success. Mr. Curle thinks it faulty, and popular for the same reason, because it is too obviously ethical. I should be inclined to criticise it rather for lack of continuity; the unity is less closely knit than in his very best work. His reputation will, to my mind, rest most securely on the three sea pieces named above, and on another of about the same length—a long short story, which conveys the tale of a whole life, but is essentially the tragic idyll of the life's close. 'The End of the Tether' may rank with Turgenev's 'Lear of the Steppes'; and it is more tragic because Captain Whalley, the sufferer, is a nobler figure than Turgenev's gigantic yeoman.

I have sometimes wondered whether the extreme of tragedy is tolerable in prose; whether the special beauty of verse and the touch of remoteness given by an artifice of rhythm may not be needed to add a quality of enjoyment to our exercise of pity and terror. Frankly, I find 'The End of the Tether' almost unbearable in its pathos; and for that reason, I own a preference for reading and re-reading what is less profoundly depressing; and 'Lord Jim' in spite of its tragic ending is not a depressing book. It is often a good plan for a critic to say quite simply what he likes and does not like in an author's work; and where I do not like Mr. Conrad it is where I find him depressing. That is not a word to use about 'The End of the Tether'; no lover of literature could read its story without feeling glad that he had read it, and without an instinctive resolution to turn back to it—even with an effort—some other day. But Mr. Conrad's temperament is sombre; and though sometimes, as in stories like 'Karain' and 'The Lagoon,' his sense of beauty and the sheer vitality of his conception make his work exhilarating as a trumpet blast, there are moments when he is, in the old phrase, less happily inspired, and others when he is not inspired at all. 'The Secret Agent,' for instance, is a powerful piece of work, but it deals with a group of characters among whom nothing likeable comes to life. One is half inclined to suspect that for once this self-suppressing artist found himself writing the 'novel with a purpose'—a dramatised pamphlet to convince the world that a civilised Europe should not tolerate such things as secret agents at all. Anyhow, I avow a total lack of desire to re-read this book. The

cases where inspiration seems to me lacking are those of 'The Return' and 'The Idiots,' both of which stories suggest the thought that Maupassant might have chosen the same subjects, but would have handled them in a quarter of the space. Nobody but Maupassant, at all events, could have made the theme of 'The Idiots' tolerable, and Mr. Conrad never has Maupassant's extraordinary directness and simplicity. But then, who has? There is, however, another of his stories, which suggests the same comparison in a very different way. 'An Outpost of 'Progress' is a short tale, but it is wonderfully complete, and the grim surprise of the ending is a piece of invention which Maupassant might have envied or devised.

Apart from its artistic quality, this story is a positive contribution to knowledge — even more perhaps than the other in which Mr. Conrad drew on the same range of experience. At one period in his career he commanded a steamboat on the Congo; that was early in the nineties, when things were happening in the Congo Free State of which the world was only beginning to hear some echoes. 'An Outpost of Progress' makes the reader realise how many of these were rendered possible by the sheer bewildered incompetence of inferior Europeans sent without training and without supervision to take charge of posts in a loneliness and a strangeness that might crush the strongest nerve. Kayerts and Carlier, types of those 'perfectly insignificant and incapable individuals whose 'existence is only rendered possible through the high organisa-'tion of civilised crowds,' represent European authority only by what little they inherit of the fear which other white men have inspired. They have no guidance from those standards of conduct, the sense of honour and fair play, by which sound offshoots of a sound European stock maintain a real superiority among less developed races. Quite literally, there is nothing in them, not even positive criminal instincts. They do not plan to sell the Company's native servants to Arab slave dealers for ivory; they only acquiesce in what a native clerk, aware of their futility, has done in their name. That is probably typical of hundreds of instances in which Europe's honour has been blackened in Central Africa by Europe's representatives. Physically too as completely as morally they collapse under the strain; and the ignominious drama of their deaths, though

it has a poetic justice, gives them really a cleaner ending than the natural operation of their surroundings would have accomplished in a few weeks or months.

The other story in which Mr. Conrad paints a West African scene gives the opposite aspect of a European's moral collapse. In 'The Heart of Darkness,' Kurtz belongs to the category of white men who inspire fear of their superhuman powers; but because he also lacks the restraint of those standards proper to his race, his strength becomes a poison not less deadly than the weakness of Kayerts and Carlier. Feeling himself beyond the control of civilisation, where the others felt themselves beyond its assistance, he breaks loose, runs mad, becomes a savage superman whom the natives of the bush worship with horrible rites. This story also, though it is the study of an exceptional, not a normal case, helps to an understanding of many things that have happened in tropical Africa.

The impression left on Mr. Conrad's sensitive mind by tropical Nature, as islands of the Pacific show it, is, broadly speaking, one of beauty; yet even with the beauty goes a sense of suffocating rankness, a crowding tangle of vegetable life which shuts in and shuts off the European who ventures into its recesses. Africa carries the same impression on him to a point where beauty disappears, choked out and overpowered by the jungle. Perhaps one feels that in Africa Mr. Conrad misses the sea, with its openness and sane airs—never far from any of the Malay regions that he paints for us. In the Congo wilds there is nothing to relieve the oppression, and we seem to follow him between walls that enclose a nightmare. Here, he seems to be saying, no white man's sanity can last; he is too far from his kind, too inconceivably remote from such human shapes as he encounters, for whom he can too easily become god or devil or both. Racial incongruity, seen already in the East as a source of almost inevitable trouble, here reaches a degree at which it seems that nothing but ill could possibly come out of such racial contact as exists.

This is an abstract way of speculating upon the work of an author who may be said to have solely an artistic purpose—and who is too disdainful to be a propagandist. But first and last the question of the contact and interplay of differing races haunts Mr. Conrad's mind—never more so than in the novel which is in

Mr. Curle's view his most important book. 'Nostromo' is the story of a marked stage in the evolution of Costaguana—a South American republic of Mr. Conrad's own construction. He has given to Costaguana its geography, with its frontage on two oceans and its huge mountain barrier shutting off that Western province whose capital is Sulaco, where the action of the book passes—with a few excursions to the not distant San Tomé silver mine, and to the Isabel island rocks lying off in the bay where Mr. Conrad has planted them; and the whole action of the book might be taken as an ironic demonstration that the native breed of Latin America, whether Creole, Indian, or half blood, can of itself accomplish nothing permanent; and that even the Europeanised Costaguanero, who resents the sight of Europeans saving his country for the good of their shareholders, sees no way to alter the nature of a people incapable of governing or being governed. The political philosophy of the book perhaps overmasters our interest in its central figure—another man who fails in fidelity.

But I think the truth is that Mr. Conrad who has lavished power on this book—for it is packed full of living people and of scenes brought sharply before the eyes—has in his very effort of creation overdone the work. Dealing with an imagined country, inventing his scene from start to finish, putting together the mountains stone by stone, instead of relying on memory for a background, he seems to feel at every moment the necessity to convince himself that his fabric is solid; he adds detail to detail, picture to picture, till at last the central intention is swamped and overlaid. It is the extreme case of that tendency to over-elaborate detail from which he is prone to suffer—except in scenes on board ship. At home, on a ship, he takes almost too much for granted; he assumes that English readers will know more of a ship than they do in reality; but his art is the gainer.

The sea stories come early in his literary career; it is pleasant therefore to claim a fully equal rank for his 'Victory,' finished just before the war began. Here is a triumphant unity, put together out of the strangest elements—exhibiting too, not only imagination, but invention of the most subtle kind. It needed a man of genius to conceive Axel Heyst, and the utmost dexterity of craftsmanship was required to bring him credibly into such a picture. Yet there he is, moving through Schom-

berg's billiard room and similar haunts of commonplace white men in the East, courteous, approachable, but always quite aloof; son of a famous thinker, and so convinced by his father's profoundly pessimistic philosophy that he has deliberately set himself to drift through existence, avoiding all responsible action, holding all interference with the life of others as necessarily evil. But in the last resort he is unable to resist those impulses in himself which express themselves habitually in his courtesy—a courtesy not of lip service. That is how he comes first to befriend a shipowner in money difficulties—with resulting entanglement in the grateful man's speculations; and next, to carry off a girl —also in distress—from a travelling concert troupe, lifting her away from the slimy advances of the disgusting Schomberg.

Again and again Mr. Conrad presents the inroads of sex passion upon a debased human type (in Willems first, and last in Donna Rita's contemptible wooer, in 'The Arrow of Gold'), and he shows it as a ravaging disease. Schomberg's hate of Heyst, which has been strong enough to surround Heyst's name with a poisonous atmosphere of calumny, takes a kind of epileptic violence from the tortures of physical jealousy; and revenge comes to his hand. He looses upon the lonely island-scene of the grateful shipowner's unsuccessful speculation, where Axel Heyst and one Chinaman lived absolutely alone till the girl was brought there, a gang of professional marauders—feral types, as Mr. Conrad phrases it, cut-throats for whom no restraint exists. There are three of these wild beasts, signalising different phases of development—the sinister chief whose weapon is the revolver, his cat-like lieutenant with the knife always strapped under his trouser leg, and their servant the hairy human ape whom they have tamed, strong as a gorilla. All these extraordinary figures are seen with the utmost clearness of outline—more than that, with their very gait visualised for us; but they are not clearer to the eye than Heyst, courteous, bronzed, and bald, with his long horizontal moustaches. The woman is less plain to sight, but the movements of her mind are pathetically disclosed, puzzled always by the pitying irony, the ineradicable formality of phrase, behind which the man who shares that island life with her cannot cease to seclude himself. She who worships Heyst knows that physical intimacy has never brought any mingling of their natures; and he who, when danger has them

by the throat, learns the extent of his tenderness for her, cannot shake off the mask which he has worn so long. The whole scene is the strangest imagination; for here are brought together, outside all law, creatures for whom tradition has no meaning. The cut-throats are debarred by no faintest scruple of decency even where the man whose life they threaten has found them at the edge of death, and taken them into the fullest hospitality; while their host, in whom thought has destroyed all power of tradition, feels himself unable to strike when tradition would bid him kill to protect. For himself it matters nothing if these visitors end the illusion of his existence; but all that is human in him rises up to condemn his abnegation of responsibility:—'Ah, Davidson, 'woe to the man who has not learned, when young, to hope, to 'love, to put his trust in life.' That is the last word of Baron Heyst's recantation before he goes to be alone with his dead—with the simple woman who had loved him, whom he had loved, and to whom even when she lay dying in his arms he could speak no simple word of natural emotion.

The conclusion so presented is worth considering, for Mr. Conrad's outlook on life is of the gloomiest; he sees life as a black business, interpenetrated with everlasting injustices. Yet here is this book to show that when a man puts into logical action a creed of coherent pessimism—that man being fundamentally a gentleman, *honnête homme* if ever there was one—the fertile impulses of Nature break up the barren logic of his conclusion. Men being here, are bound to serve; fidelity demands more of them than an abstinence from injuring their neighbours; pity is only a mockery unless it issues in action.

If I deal with this novelist as a teacher of conduct through example, as a moral philosopher whose code, definite or indefinite, conveys itself as a whole, it is largely because of what a young soldier said to me lately. He told me that for him and his friends Mr. Conrad's work had become the most significant and valued thing in contemporary literature. There was, as he put it, a 'cult of Conrad' among them; they aimed after a 'Conradic 'attitude towards life.' This is the sincerest tribute which a writer can receive, and in some ways the greatest. Also, one may be allowed to remark, it is a fortunate homage for those who pay it. They will get from the author of their choice a finely tempered interpretation of that standard of honour by

which English tradition is distinguished at its best, and they will get it free of the superstition that honour, or even 'good 'form,' is the monopoly of any one race. Perhaps indeed the strength of Mr. Conrad's moral influence may lie in the fact that he has deliberately adopted much, has been consciously attracted by much, that is instinctive in natural heirs of the tradition. There is no denying the completeness of his assimilation; yet he has earned what he holds as if by inheritance, and just because he has earned it, he is the more conscious of its quality. It is exactly as with the language. If he had not written in English, he says, he would never have written at all; it was, in short, the inevitable vehicle for his imagination. But although no living writer can render English speech more perfectly in all its subtleties of idiom, the tongue he uses is not exactly to him what it is to the rest of us. Its very idioms, he says, have in his belief had a plastic effect on his mind; he is in short more aware of the medium he works in than those whose mother speech it is. He learnt it by falling in love with it; it was an excitement to his imagination. Just so, in becoming an English seaman as it were in defiance of Nature, he learnt more than one who reached that goal naturally; and he testifies of what he has seen and known with the double vision of the native and the foreigner. He would hold, no doubt, that the special virtues of English life are best learnt on the element where English energy has found its most characteristic expression; that you will learn to be an Englishman most thoroughly on board an English ship. At all events, he has learnt to some purpose; and for an exposition of English ideals of conduct, at once subtle and austere, it would be wise to refer any student to the works of this naturalised citizen.

Of his rank among novelists it is too soon to speak with confidence; but except Mr. Hardy, a survivor who continues to yield like some old apple tree of a lost stock in his Wessex, no living English novelist could count upon the opinion of his craft to set him above Mr. Conrad. He has no admitted superior in his own generation—which includes Stevenson; and I agree with Mr. Curle in putting Stevenson below Mr. Conrad as a creative artist. Though not a prolific writer, Mr. Conrad has created an amazing number of living figures, and his power is unimpaired. I do not rank his last book, 'The Arrow of Gold,' in the first class of his work, although it is one of the pleasantest and most

exhilarating to read. Love is here as nowhere else his main theme—love between equals. Donna Rita has certainly the quality of an intoxicant about her, but of a rare wine not a drug; and I am thankful for the glimpse of Dominic and his Teresa. 'The Mirror of the Sea' lets us know that here Mr. Conrad has been drawing on his early experience when he too was a gun runner for Carlists between Marseilles and Spain.

Yet to my apprehension there is nothing in the whole book to approach the intensity of characterisation which he reaches at his best, and never more decisively than in 'Victory.' He has contrived there what would seem almost impossible—to convey the effect of a personality through its silence. Mrs. Schomberg is almost the pivot of the book. Yet she is a commonplace, dowdy, aged, and bullied woman, moving like an automaton, too cowed to speak—opening her lips only in secrecy and then with the fewest words. But the impression left is that of a deadly, remorseless, unsuspected force, whose power lies in its apparent impotence.

Mr. Conrad makes great demands on his readers' attention, and this has limited his vogue, though not his fame. English folk will do well to cherish that fame, for whatever increases it enhances as great a tribute as was ever paid to a nation by a private individual. Partly from what is related concerning the facts of his life by himself and by Mr. Curle, but principally from his work, one can conclude with assurance that Mr. Conrad cut himself adrift from his own country with no desire of either notoriety or gain, but in pursuit of an ideal which he felt to be only realisable for him in the life of England. I say 'England' and 'English,' for it is of England that Mr. Conrad thinks and speaks; England and not the British Empire is the mistress of his allegiance. Perhaps one who is not an Englishman may be allowed to affirm that this allegiance has been given with a fine discernment of England's real nobility; and that this adopted citizen has done at least as much as any Englishman of his time to inform and vitalise and purify that ideal of England which each English generation must maintain and recreate for itself.

STEPHEN GWYNN.

PHYSIOLOGUS OF ALEXANDRIA

Der griechische Physiologus und seine orientalischen Uebersetzungen. Von Prof. Dr. EMIL PETERS. Berlin: Calvary & Co. 1898.

'PHYSIOLOGUS' has a singular history, rare in human records: a book without any single author, having the unlettered folk for its authors, the whole world for its readers. For more than a thousand years its popularity endured, and it was not published until its day was over and it had become a subject for polite sarcasm instead of servile veneration.

To the humanist there is in 'Physiologus' matter of far more moment than any question of prosody or syntax. It is a record of the European mind in two stages—the childish stage of happy ignorance, the later stage of gloomy (sometimes terrible) strivings after the unknown. To the former stage belong the grotesque animal fables which were related as actual happenings, without any misgiving as to their accuracy or any desire to question them further. Many of them would appeal to a child of to-day far more directly than any record of actual fact. Tell a child that the tiger's stripes serve to conceal his approach through the jungle, and he is quite uninterested; but tell him, as 'Physiologus' does, that the tigress keeps her cubs enclosed in a glass ball which she rolls before her, and the child will feel that a new pleasure has been added to existence.

In this first stage of pure fable the stories of 'Physiologus' were no doubt the current property of all Mediterranean peoples long before the Christian era. But in the form in which we have them they are either preceded or followed by a statement of Christian dogma; and the animal habit is represented as the disclosure of a hidden verity, of which the outward fact is merely the sign or token. In the story of the wasp we read:—

'What spiritual truth do we learn from this? For this has not been ordered foolishly by the Creator of all things, but has been ordained for our instruction, so that by considering visible things we undertake the knowledge of the invisible. For that which cannot be seen by reason of the dullness of our bodies is pictured to us, as it were, through a form or

image of Him who cares for all things which by Him were brought into being.'

So in the tale of the lion whose cubs are born dead, and lie inanimate for three days, we are introduced to the symbol of the resurrection; for on the third day comes the lion, and breathes over his offspring and awakens them. And the story of the pelican unfolds the essence of the old dispensation as well as of the new:—

'The snake is very evil minded toward the young of the pelican. But the pelican, what does he devise? He fastens his nest on a high place and builds a hedge around it on all sides against the snake. But the evil-minded snake, what does he do? He looks around to see from what direction the wind comes, and from thence he blows the poison towards the nest, killing the young ones. Now comes the pelican and finds her children dead. Then she looks up to a cloud and flies there, and, striking her side with her wings until blood streams, she lets the drops fall through the cloud down upon the bodies of her young, and they come to life again. The pelican is the Lord; the children are Adam and Eve and their race; the snake is the evil one; and the nest is paradise. Then the evil one blows, and they become dead through sin. But now our Lord is raised on the cross and pierced in the side, and sends to us through the cloud of the Holy Ghost the gift of eternal life.'

And the commentary on the story of the phœnix concludes thus:—

'What an image and symbol is here pictured by the Creator for the instruction of mankind. For God, the Creator of the mystery which was fulfilled in Christ, did hereby inform us of that which He had decreed. Christ came like the phœnix after a long period of years, and taking our nature, He brought the sweet spices of life. And He willingly raised His cross on Golgotha, in the town Jerusalem, just as the phœnix prepared the altar and laid himself upon it in the city of the sun in Egypt. And Christ suffered death and parted His soul from His body, just as the phœnix lays himself down on his back and burns himself to death. And as, on the third day, the new arisen worm takes the form of the phœnix, so by that same mystery God the Word caused His body to rise again the third day. And as on the third day the worm of the phœnix took its full and perfect form, so in like manner the body of Christ, when He arose from the grave, became immortal and unchangeable. And as at length the phœnix returns to India, his former dwelling place, so did Christ, after He had arisen, carry His body to His eternal dwelling place.'

In the first three centuries of the Christian era, Alexandria was the centre of an intellectual cyclone, the eye of the storm

of doctrines which then raged throughout the Mediterranean world. The mental activity of the time and place was intense, but it was the activity of a disturbed ant-hill. Here met the doctrines of East and West, survivals of Egyptian nature worship clashing with the dreams of neo-Judaism and the visions of decadent Greeks. But while these creeds seemed to be at war with one another, they were in reality all framed on the assumption that this world is under the dominion of the powers of evil, and that true religion consisted in a device or trick or formula whereby the powers of evil could be defeated. The doctrine of the Incarnation is twisted into a device, which God was compelled to adopt in order to deceive the superior cunning of Satan. For, says 'Physiologus' in the story of the ichneumon, 'If Christ had attacked the devil without taking a mortal body, 'the devil would have resisted Him.' And the strategy is still further expounded in the story of the lion:—

'His cunning is such that when he is hunted he wipes out with his tail the traces of his footsteps as he goes along, so that none can trace him. For thus did God stealthily lower Himself by degrees through the orders of prophets and apostles until He became fleshly man, and thus He vanquished the devil. As the devil had deceived man, so God by a more cunning stratagem deceived the devil.'

And in a similar argument, in the story of the unicorn, is added the words, 'The heavenly powers could not of themselves 'accomplish the work.'

This conception of the Incarnation as a clever device to deceive the devil—a sort of hide-and-seek stratagem—is only one instance of the degradation of doctrine into formula which had taken place between the first and the second century of the Christian era. Other instances occur in 'Physiologus.' Thus, in the story of the otter, we see the importance attached to the descent into hell:—

'There is a beast called otter, which has the form of a dog and is a great enemy of crocodiles. When the crocodile sleeps, its mouth is always open. Then the otter approaches and smears its whole body with mud, and when the mud is dry it springs into the mouth of the crocodile and tears its entrails.

'The otter is the type of our Saviour, and the crocodile is the devil. For after our Lord took upon Him His earthly flesh He went down into hell.'

So, again, in the story of the ichneumon :—

'He is the enemy of dragons, and when he finds a very wild dragon he goes and smears himself with mud and covers his nose with his tail. In like manner our Saviour took upon Him our earthly body, and hid His divinity in it, until He had slain the great dragon which sat by the river of Egypt. For if Christ had attacked the dragon without taking a mortal body, then the dragon would have seen that He was the Saviour and would have opposed Him.'

Throughout the stories, the doctrine of the resurrection is dwarfed into insignificance by the episode of the descent into hell and the conflict with the powers of darkness. The story of the ape gives a general view of the sway exercised by the Prince of Evil :—

'This animal is very imitative. Whatever it sees men do, immediately it does the same. Therefore, he who wishes to catch an ape takes bird lime, and pretends to anoint his eyes therewith. Then he goes away leaving the lime behind him. And when the hunter has hidden himself, the ape comes out of his hole and anoints his eyes as he has seen the hunter do, and he becomes blind and knows not where he is. And as soon as the hunter sees that the ape is blinded he approaches with a cord and fastens it round the ape's neck, and ties the other end to a tree. And the ape steps up and down and becomes tame by force.

'In this manner does the devil, the great hunter, chase us. He brings with him the bird lime of sin, and he shows man how to blind his eyes and darken his mind, and draws him on from sin to sin, and makes of it a great snare of rope, and holds him fast in the snare, saying, "There is now no salvation for thee ; thou has brought thyself low, and art no longer worthy to enter the Church. How canst thou clear thyself from thy sins? If thou has not repented already, thou wilt most surely put off repentance in the future." And to-day or to-morrow comes death, the thief, and bears away the impenitent.'

Such being the power of the Prince of Darkness, what is the remedy? The Epistle to the Romans was known to the 'Physiologus' copyist, and indeed is sometimes quoted by him ; but its message of justification by faith had lost its freshness for him. Instead, the Alexandrian scribe demands a spell, a formula, an incantation.

To the taunt of Celsus that the Christians had no magical formula, Origen replied that they had the mystic and incommunicable name of three letters and the potent sign of the cross. In the 'Physiologus' story of the ibis the mystical aspect of the sign is insisted on :—

'The ibis is unclean, according to the law. He knows not how to dive under the water, but loves the shallow water, and the mouths of rivers, and there he seeks his food. As he cannot dive to the depths where the pure fishes dwell, his life is spent in the shallows where the impure fishes abide. Do thou, O man, learn to dive deep, so that thou mayest reach the depths of the wisdom and knowledge of God. Moreover, if thou dost not stretch out thine hand and make the sign of the cross, thou wilt never sail over the sea of life. For the sign of the cross is powerful over all creatures. . . . Moses when he stretched out his hands conquered Amalek, so did Daniel subdue the lions, and Jonah abide in the belly of the sea monster; Thekla was cast before wild beasts and sea-lions, and the sign of the cross saved her; Susannah was delivered from the elders, Judith from Holofernes, Esther from Ahasuerus, and the three men from the fiery furnace.'

There is another reference to the Thekla legend in the story of the whale:—

'There is a great monster in the sea called whale. He has two attributes. His first attribute is this: when he is hungry he opens wide his jaws, and therefrom streams a very sweet savour. And all the little fishes gather themselves in heaps and shoals around the whale's mouth and it swallows them all, but the full grown fish keep away from him. So do the devil and the heretic, through their pleasant speaking and the seduction of their savour tempt the simple and those who are wanting in judgment. But they of good, firm understanding are not so caught. Job was a fully grown fish, as also were Moses, Jeremiah, Isaiah, and the whole choir of prophets. So, likewise, had Judith power to escape from Holofernes, Esther from Ahasuerus, Susannah from the elders, and Thekla from Thamyris.'

Both these references are important as showing the degradation of doctrine between the first and the second centuries. The original story of Thekla, as disinterred by Professor Ramsay, is as follows:—

A citizen of Iconium was warned, in a vision, to meet on the highroad a small man with heavy eyebrows meeting over the nose, bald headed, bow legged, strongly built, and with an expression sometimes as of an angel. By this description he was able to recognise Paul, who accompanied him to his house and there expounded the gospel. Thekla was moved by Paul's teaching to desert her affianced husband, Thamyris. Thereupon, the families of both the betrothed preferred a charge against Paul to the effect that he had influenced the mind of Thekla by magical arts, and Paul was expelled from the city of Iconium. Thekla followed the apostle to Antioch. There she was brought before

the Roman governor on a charge of sacrilege, and was condemned to be exposed to the wild beasts. She met with much sympathy, and was sheltered by Queen Tryphæna until the day of the games. On that day Thekla was exposed to a lioness, who licked her feet; then to a bear, who was driven off by the lioness. Thereupon, on the intervention of the Queen, Thekla was liberated, and going to the pond in the arena she entered it and baptized herself and the lioness. Afterwards she was adopted by Queen Tryphæna as her daughter.

Around this simple story, founded (as Professor Ramsay believes) on actual events, all kinds of embroideries were woven in the following century. In the later version, which no doubt was referred to by the Alexandrian scribe, Paul has become a hermit, and Thekla, in man's attire, dwells with him in a cavern. She is no longer permitted to administer baptism, either to herself or to the lioness—but her miracles rival those of the apostle in number and importance. The two points most insisted on by the 'Physiologus' writer are not in the original story at all. Thekla did not subdue wild animals by the sign of the cross, and she did not retire from the world and consecrate herself to virginity.

In the fable of the bee we have another picture of the Christian Church :—

'Solomon the wise said, concerning the bee, "Smallest among birds is the bee, and yet his savour is the chief among sweet things."

'"Physiologus" says that bees dwell together in a great company. They go in by one door, they work at the same task, which they pursue diligently, flying together and hastening to perform their common work. And what is greater than this, they live under a king, or prince, of like nature with themselves, and they do not venture to begin their common work nor hurry to the meadows and flowers until the king, who is over them, has made the beginning. They do not elect their ruler, but his overlordship comes to him by the rule and custom which the Creator set before them to guide them. Every ruler has a sting, but he is not accustomed to use it. Yet when he is provoked to turn out of the way and sting, he is at once punished, for as soon as he wounds a man with his sting, it remains in the wound and he himself surely dies from the pain.

'The bees gather honey from plants, making use of their mouths, and they draw wax from the flowers by the use of their feet. And the bees carry away the honey they gather, and with the wax they build their cells with great skill, making holes wherein they pour the honey. And when violent winds arise while they are away from

home, they drop down and sit on a stone, or rock, until the violence of the wind has abated, when they return to their house.

'Let us consider what is the spiritual meaning of this: what does it picture to our human reason? The feeble bees who dwell together in a community, and carefully set about a common task, are the righteous souls of the sons of the Church. These dwell like a flock in the same church, and engage in the same work, that is the holy mysteries. There is also a prince, or leader, appointed to them, who is a partaker of their nature; for God has placed as leader in the Church the arch presbyter, who partakes of human nature, so that no confusion may befall the ordinances. This leader possesses a sting with which he wounds not, and the sting is liberty, which is given by God, alike to the arch presbyter and to his disciples. Yet the arch presbyter wounds not with the sting, but defends holiness with his liberty, and turns it away from licence.'

This picture is however exceptional, for with a goodly number of the scribes who copied the 'Physiologus' stories, the way of salvation had become the way of the monastery or the hermitage. Thus in the parable of the beaver, which is suggested apparently by the similarity between 'castor' and 'castrare,' it is related that the male beaver, to escape capture, bites off his organs of reproduction and presents them to the hunter. The moral is the virtue of mutilation, and we are told that though 'the patriarchs sought for increase, the apostles, in whom 'was the true way of life, practised abstinence, longing only for 'heavenly seed.' The parable of the unicorn is written in praise of virginity:—

'It is a small beast like a goat; but it is very wary, and the hunter cannot approach it because it possesses great cunning. It has a horn in the middle of its head. Let us now relate how it is caught. They send in search of it a pure virgin, all robed. And the unicorn immediately springs into the lap of the maiden, and she subdues him and he follows her, and so she leads him to the king's palace. By this we see that the unicorn is the image of our Saviour, the horn of salvation raised for us in the house of our father, David. The heavenly powers could not of themselves accomplish the work, but he had to become flesh, and to dwell in the body of the true Virgin Mary.'

The parable of the swallow, as the type of the perfect ascetic, was probably written by one who dwelt in a more northerly climate than that of Alexandria; but the monastic ideal is the same:—

'The swallow appears in the summer time, when the winter is past and gone. Then in the early dawn she twitters and wakes the sleeper

and calls to work. So the perfected ascetic, when the winter of the body is past and every fleshly desire extinguished, rising in purity from his couch, remembers first in the early dawn to resort to the Word of God; and in Him is fulfilled the Scripture, "In the morning shall the Lord hear thy voice."'

Thus does 'Physiologus' improve the story of the Gorgon:—

'Her hair is like gold, but her face is death. At times she plays and laughs, and then again she roams around the mountains of the west, raging furiously. And when the day of her longing comes upon her she stands upright and cries aloud, first with the voice of a lion and of the other wild animals, then like a herd of cattle, then with a human voice, and then like a winged dragon; and she says, "Come to me and satisfy the desire of the flesh." And all who hear her come swiftly and gaze upon her. For she knows all languages of beasts and of men, of cattle and of birds. But as soon as they see her, then, at once they die.

'Now, in what way does the enchanter overcome her? He can read in the stars the place of her abiding, and wanders thither, enchanting her from afar. She then at once begins to cry out like a lion and like all the other wild animals. And when the enchanter comes within hearing of her voice he answers her, saying, "Dig a hole near by the river, and lay thy head inside so that I may not see thee and die, and I will come to thee." And she does as he has said. Then comes the enchanter and, without looking, cuts off her head. And he does not even look upon the head, lest he should die. And when he takes the head he holds it in a vessel. But when he sees a dragon or fierce animals or wicked men, he holds before them the head of the Gorgon and turns them to stone, even as King Alexander subdued and conquered all peoples. And so thou, too, O man, if thy mind be inclined to wisdom, shalt rule unharmed over the powers of evil.'

As the preceding extracts show, there is much that is quaint in the 'Physiologus' stories, apart from their perverted morals. Childhood might yet rejoice over them as exceedingly simple records of actual happenings in the animal world. Take this story of the bird, 'Charadrius':—

'It is wholly white, and has no black in it. It is found in kings' palaces. And when anyone is ill they can learn from Charadrius whether the sick man will die or recover. They carry the bird to the bedside of the sick man, and then, if the sickness is unto death, the bird turns its face away from the bed, and all know that the sick man will surely die. But if the illness is not mortal, then the bird looks very sharply at the sick man; and the sick man looks toward the bird, and the bird sucks up the disease into his own body, and flies up into the regions of the sun and spreads his wings in the heat of the sunbeams,

and burns up the illness; and the bird himself is saved and the sick man with him.'

Or this picture of the domestic life of the pelican:—

'He loves his young very much. When the young are born, and as soon as they are a little grown, they strike their parents in the face. Then the parents strike back again and kill them. But presently the parents begin to have remorse and compassion; and after they have mourned three whole days over the children they have killed, the mother comes at the end of the third day and opens her side and drops her blood upon the dead bodies of the young, and they come to life again.'

Or this picture of the peacock:—

'He is the most gaily coloured of all birds, and his plumage is lordly. As he passes by he looks at himself, and rejoices much at his appearance. He shakes himself, turns a somersault, and gazes proudly around. But when he glances at his feet he screams wildly, for his feet are not suitable to his beautiful appearance.'

The story of the elephant, although constructed to lead up to a particular inference is, nevertheless, related with childlike simplicity:—

'When the elephant has fallen he cannot rise again, for his limbs have no joints. He begins, therefore, to weep and cry aloud. Another elephant hears the cry and comes to help him, but he is not able to raise the fallen one. Then they both weep and cry aloud. Thereupon, twelve more elephants come to help them; but they are not able to raise the fallen one, and they all together weep and cry aloud. Last of all comes the little elephant, and lays his trunk gently against the fallen elephant and lifts him up from the ground. And the nature of the little elephant is such that if you burn his bones or his hair in any place whatever, that place is for ever free from devils or snakes, nor will any evil thing ever be found there.'

A time came when the doctrinal and devotional part of 'Physiologus' lost its direct appeal. An organised Church extending over the civilised world, with the Roman pontiff at its head, could not be expected to regard with favour popular stories which spoke of the time when the Church was of the household, when there were no bishops and but one sacrament, and the elder was but a lay reader. Moreover, the Roman curia could not fail to notice the occasional intrusion of Gnostic heresy or Egyptian superstition. Not even the great names to which the authorship had been attributed—Solomon, Tatian,

Epiphanius, Basil the Great, John Chrysostom—could save it from condemnation, and 'Physiologus,' together with the 'Acta 'Theklæ,' fel lunder the ban of the Church. This no doubt accounts for the fact that in many of the stories in the later manuscripts the doctrinal part is altogether suppressed, or else reduced to the merest shred. In the later versions, which began with the 'Liber Fisiologus' of Abbot Thetbaldus (1030 *circ.*), the different tone begins to be apparent. Either the story is given as a piece of natural history simply, or there is a brief moral in the sense of a warning against misconduct, or an invocation to better habits. The best, perhaps, of these later collections is that which Philippe de Thaun prepared for Adelisa, the second wife of our Henry I. In their new form of 'Bestiaries,' the stories were increasingly popular, perhaps because they were beginning to be enlivened by the rising spirit of humour. A study of the wood carvings in many of our early Gothic buildings reveals the birds and beasts of 'Physiologus.' In the choir stalls of Ripon, Beverley, Lincoln, and Westminster, and even in parish churches may be found Charadrius gazing sharply, the pelican 'in her 'piety,' the fox feigning death, or the peacock screaming at his feet. These fables were more familiar to the wood carvers than the incidents of either the Old or the New Testaments. But the artists had evidently begun to regard them not simply and reverently, but with the sense of humour which was by that time beginning to revive again upon the earth. There is, for instance, at Gamlingay, in Cambridgeshire, a carving of an ape with blackened eyes, the meaning of which has given rise to controversy. It shows that the carver not only knew the 'Physiologus' story, but also appreciated its grotesque side. And when we find a carving of a fox preaching in the habit of a friar, we see that the world was already growing ripe for the 'Praise of Folly.'

How did it come to pass that the Greek intellect sank to the level represented in the stories of 'Physiologus'? In the answer to that question—if it could be answered—lies the secret of the Dark Ages. What had happened to the people who crowned Sophocles, and built the Nereid temple? Their speech was still spoken in the streets of Alexandria. Why did it sound so empty and void of meaning? It is true that in Alexandria the intellectual impulse lasted longer than it had done in Attica,

perhaps kept alive by the commercial life of a busy seaport; but it reached the same goal of inanition, though by a more lingering decay. We may compare the process to that which takes place in a plant brought from a keen northern air, and cultivated in a hothouse, where it blazes into a splendour of growth, and presently withers and dies. So the Greek tribes came from northern uplands into the close air of the tideless Mediterranean, flourished for a time in unexampled glory, and then decayed. The analogy is no explanation, but it suggests that there is an explanation to be found in physical processes not peculiar to that race or that period.

But the Greek intellect might have been enfeebled, and the Greek literature might have been lost without producing the Dark Ages. The phenomenon is more sinister. There is not merely a loss of all interest in the things of this world—there is also a dread of the things of the other world. Nor is this the attitude of the unlearned or the undevout; it is shared by the fathers of Alexandrian theology. Plotinus puts it in its mildest form when he says, 'If this body, this burden we carry 'about with us is not utterly evil, it is certainly not good. It 'is simply nothing. Why take care of it? It is sufficient 'humiliation for us to have to take this shadow about with us, 'even for a single day. The wise man is he who will suffer 'it to disappear.' Porphyry, called by Augustine 'most learned 'of philosophers,' had studied the gospels and the Pauline epistles. He had assimilated, as he believed, all that is best in the teaching of Plato and of Christ, and the conclusion to which he came was that we were living under an evil dispensation; that all religions were hopelessly inadequate. Try as we might to approach God by retreating from worldly pleasures, by meditation and by prayer, we should still find every way of approach barred by the powers of evil. Prayer is of no more avail than the arts of the soothsayer. Magical rites and incantations, unlawful though they may be, are in fact the only resource left to man in his contest with the powers of darkness. The practical outcome of such a mental attitude would appear to be universal suicide, and this was urged in Alexandrian lecture rooms by Hegesias and others; and so many followed the advice that the practice had to be stayed by imperial decree.

Many of the moralisings of 'Physiologus' reproduce for us this dark state of mind when the world is without interest and without hope, unimportant at best, and at worst, demoniac. When this attitude of mind became associated with a despotic organisation extending over the whole of Christendom, the wonder is not how it lasted so long, but how it ever came to be superseded. Perhaps the last outward manifestation, on a large scale, of the mind of the Dark Ages was the persecution of witches, which, even with the approval of the enlightened, survived into the eighteenth century.

Luther was the last theologian to take any notice of 'Physiologus,' and his notice was contemptuous. Thenceforward the stories began to fall into oblivion, from which they were rescued only in the nineteenth century by a few scholars who took an interest in the grammar and syntax of the Armenian, Anglo-Saxon, Icelandic, or old Gothic manuscripts of the tales. What would Justin Martyr or Basil the Great have said could they have known that the most recent study of the 'Physiologus' is entirely devoted to the linguistic peculiarities to be found in an Anglo-Saxon manuscript in the Munich Library?

JAMES CARLILL.

THE FIRST PHASE AT SEA

1. **History of the Great War.** Based on Official Documents: by Direction of the Historical Section of the Committee of Imperial Defence. **Naval Operations.** Vol. I. To the Battle of the Falklands, December 1914. By SIR JULIAN S. CORBETT. Longmans, Green. 1920.

2. **The Grand Fleet — 1914-16.** By Admiral VISCOUNT JELLICOE of Scapa, G.C.B., O.M., G.C.V.O. Cassell. 1919.

WE welcome Sir Julian Corbett's first volume for many reasons, and not least for this—that it is a proof of the desire of the Admiralty to cause the 'Naval Operations' of the late war to be worthily recorded at an early date. It may be presumed that the authorities at Whitehall do not intend to debar themselves from producing, at some future time, a 'Staff History,' composed by naval officers for naval officers. In the meantime we are not to be left to piece the story together out of books on this or that part of the whole, reminiscences of participants in the struggle, or compilations from Gazettes and 'public letters,' done as private ventures. Sir Julian's four, or perhaps five, volumes are to be based on much more than such official matter as was allowed to appear during the war. He draws of course on works, native and foreign, which have already been printed, and he will continue to avail himself of others as they appear in future. It is a question whether he will find it possible to confine himself even to the larger number of proposed volumes he names. A long experience has shown that the most practised writer is liable to under-estimate the space he will require to exhaust his subject. We are prepared to see the five grow to seven before he writes his last line—and that though one very important part of the war on the water, the fortunes of our merchant shipping while the struggle lasted, is to be independently dealt with by Mr. C. Ernest Fayle and Mr. Archibald Hurd. Separate treatment in such a case is at least as likely to lead to repetition as to

greater brevity. We shall know how that may be when all the work is done.

The position, or character, of this history is exactly defined in a note (to which we naturally attribute official authority), conspicuously placed in front of the title-page. 'The Lords 'Commissioners of the Admiralty have given the author access 'to official documents in the preparation of this work, but they 'are in no way responsible for his reading or presentation of 'the facts as stated.' 'In no way responsible' would be a very misleading formula, if it did not imply 'have in no way inter- 'fered.' We are to understand that Sir Julian Corbett has investigated and arranged, with all the freedom enjoyed by Mr. Gardiner, or any other historian who consulted sources at the Record Office, or at Simancas, for the events of past centuries. If that were not so then what we have to appreciate here would be, not a summing up by the judge, but an address by counsel speaking to a brief. The evidence which he has had before him —putting aside private and foreign narratives—has been, he tells us :—

'1. Reports, papers, and records of the Committee of Imperial Defence.

'2. The "in" and "out" series of Admiralty telegrams.

'3. Letters of proceedings, reports and dispatches of admirals and senior naval officers. These have been carefully checked, especially for actions, by deck logs, signal and wireless logs, and engine-room registers, and wherever possible by reference to the officers concerned.

'4. Admiralty correspondence with other departments of State, especially the Foreign Office, War Office, Colonial Office, and India Office.

'5. Depositions of prisoners, captured documents, and other intelligence reports.

'6. War Office records of analogous nature so far as they relate to combined operations, or affect the distribution and action of the fleet.'

This is far more than has ever been spontaneously put at the disposal of Sir Julian's predecessors among historians of 'late' wars, whether they were private labourers in the vineyard or 'societies of gentlemen.' Not even Josiah Burchett, who was Secretary of the Admiralty, was quite so well provided for his accounts of the wars of William III. and Queen Anne. It is not the least of the merits of the book that good charts, some bound in the volume, others lodged in a separate case, are

supplied as illustrations to the text. In short, Sir Julian's narrative of the naval operations down to the date he reaches —that is to say, the destruction of Admiral von Spee's Squadron at the Falkland Islands in December 1914—differs altogether from the rather too numerous 'popular' histories written for the day and from the outside, of which there has been no lack, as history does from journalism. It must be added that he has had the very valuable help of a staff of professional assistants.

The most abundant supply of authentic evidence, the most copious provision of illustrative apparatus, good though they be as far as they go, are not enough. The volume given us is after all a selection from a vast mass of documents, a narrative, an interpretation of events, and an exposition of causes and consequences. Its value must depend mainly on the author's judgment first in deciding which of all the facts he had to select from were essential, and then on his exposition. Sir Julian Corbett has manifestly striven to do the work of an historian, not only by presenting a full collection of real testimony, but by abstaining from rhetoric and appeals to mere feeling of passion or of prejudice. He almost goes out of his way to give the Germans credit for every display of gallantry, skill, magnanimity, and humanity which he can find to put to their account. There are times when he is content to be almost frigid. Some episodes—the destruction of the *Pegasus* at Zanzibar by the *Königsberg* for instance, which might well have been a provocation to picturesque writing, are recorded with the cool restraint of an entry in a ledger. The fault, if it is a fault, is not a grave one in a book which is designed to tell us what happened, and how, and why.

Sir Julian will be prepared to discover that he does not secure universal adhesion when his immediate theme is what men commonly call 'principles,' but would perhaps do better to name reasons and meanings. There is visible and ample excuse for difference of opinion in such a passage of statement of doctrine as this.

'The dominant problem [before the opening of the war] had been to fix the disposition of the main fleet. The reversal of the old geographical conditions, which was the outstanding difficulty of a war with Germany, overrode all the considerations which had determined the key positions of the fleet in former wars, and a new one had to be found

from which it could best discharge its primary functions. What those functions had always been must be clearly apprehended, for of recent years, by a strange misreading of history, an idea had grown up that its primary function is to seek out and destroy the enemy's main fleet. This view, being literary rather than historical, was nowhere adopted with more unction than in Germany, where there was no naval tradition to test its accuracy. So securely was it held by our enemy, that it seems to have coloured their naval policy with a sanguine expectation that we should at once seek out their fleet where it most wished to be found; and when they saw their hope unrealised, they consoled themselves—probably quite sincerely—with taunts that the British Navy had lost its old spirit, and was no longer to be feared.

'How the false conception which the Germans adopted arose is difficult to explain, unless it be that so often the most attractive personalities amongst our admirals had performed their most brilliant exploits when in command of secondary fleets, and that these exploits form the most stirring pages in the story. But the truth is that with rare and special exceptions, as when the enemy's chief naval force was not based on the Home Area, our main or Grand Fleet always operated from its Home Station. *Its paramount duty was to secure the command of Home Waters for the safety of our coasts and trade. There was no question of seeking out the enemy, for normally his fleet lay behind his base defences where it was inaccessible. All our own fleet could do was to take the most suitable position for confining him to port or bringing him to action if he put to sea.*' (The italics are ours.)

The decidedly magisterial tone which Sir Julian Corbett adopts here may prove exasperating to some readers. It will occur to not a few of them—and we boldly confess that we are of the number—to reply by disputing Sir Julian's facts, and not only so, but by telling him that we find it impossible to attach any definite meaning to some of these statements. Were the Dutch not operating in the Home Area when they were sought out and fought out by Blake and Monk, the Duke of York, Myngs, Lawson, and Rupert with the grand fleets of the day? What else was Hawke doing when he followed Conflans into Quiberon Bay, or Howe, when he pursued Villaret Joyeuse? We secured our coasts and trade by seeking out the enemy's fleet and in no other way. We are in pressing danger of entangling ourselves in a mere juggle with words if we say that fleets which blockaded the enemy in Brest or Toulon, the Texel, Ferrol, or Cadiz, were not seeking him, simply because he was taking refuge behind fortifications. Would it occur to any military historian that Massena was not seeking the British army in Portugal because he could not venture to assail it in

Wellington's carefully prepared defensive position at Torres Vedras? A tendency to extract sunbeams of strategical, or tactical, principles from prosaic cucumbers of fact has always been a weakness of Sir Julian Corbett's. His Dulcinea has led him here—not for the first time—into making distinctions which correspond to no real difference, and classifications which exist in words alone. Enumerations of doctrine of this kind are terribly apt to be just what General Hamley called 'gilt 'farthings.'

If there were nothing in this and some similar passages but a use of words which to us seems futile, they might be left alone. But we detect in them the germ of a very bad heresy in the conduct of war. It is that particular deviation from sound principles which Napoleon blamed in his admirals. They had, he said, found out somewhere—he could not imagine where—that war can be effectually conducted without running risks. A good deal which is to be found in Sir Julian's pages leaves a very distinct impression that there was also in the air at the Admiralty an influence which tended to the adoption of the poor creed that management can do better than hard hitting, and that holding back is a good way of reserving strength for a decisive stroke.

Now both propositions are thoroughly sound in given circumstances. To rush blindly at your enemy, regardless of his strength, and reckless of consequences, is an action one can understand, and in a way admire, in Sir Richard Grenville, off Flores in the Azores.' He was an Elizabethan, a man of the, Renaissance, a descendant, so he believed, of Norse Sea Kings, a disciple of 'Virtù.' He wished to die in a blaze of glory, and be a name of renown for ever. A modern man who should act in the same fashion would do what most of Dick Grenville's contemporaries thought he had done—namely, set an example of headstrong folly. And he would throw away, what was not his to spend, for his own sake alone—the ship and the lives of his men. But it is possible to be daring without being a 'berserk.' The Dutch Admiral de Ruyter was a modern fighter, and in the great campaign on the Banks of Flanders in 1673, when he was 'sought' by a far more numerous fleet than his own he managed and held back. But only till he saw the opportunity to strike, and then he did not hesitate for a moment to engage superior numbers. It is right to be prudent, it is no less right to be bold.

The great leaders know how to be both. The weak man cannot support the strain of waiting. He may sometimes seek relief in a rush on the enemy which the French neatly call *une fuite en avant*, a bolt to the front. It is more probable that the weak man will be so much in love with caution that he will be for ever looking for reasons why he should not be bold. Observe that it is not a question of personal courage. We have in our own naval history the cases of Torrington, of Byng, whose physical bravery was undoubted, and the disappointing career of Sir Roger Curtis, which puzzled many of his brother officers, for he was a most valiant man when only his own life was in peril. It is possible for an officer to deserve the blame which a minister of the time is said to have passed on the French Admiral Tourville—to be *poltron de tête* though not *de cœur*. An everlasting anxiety to be on the safe side tends to produce 'poltroonery' of head in even stout-hearted men who will flinch from nothing when a superior bears the responsibility for taking the risk of defeat. If the superior is not an admiral or general on the spot, but a sovereign or minister at headquarters, he also may be *poltron de tête* and then he will be constantly urging caution on his officers. There will be a never ending refrain of 'avoid engaging a superior enemy,' 'wait for 'more,' 'provide reserve behind reserve,' 'better to wait than to 'run risks.' To speak with candour there are too many signs of this nervous dread of an untoward incident, this intellectually timid desire for a profusion of means to be heaped together before action is taken, scattered about in Sir Julian Corbett's first volume. And, perhaps under the influence of his Dulcinea, he treats it with too much tenderness.

The poltroonery of head was not in the officers and men. Far from it. We have only to remember the example of Sir Christopher Cradock.* The case is typical all round and deserves

* What is said here must be understood to apply only to the actual engagement with Admiral von Spee. The previous movements of Sir Christopher Cradock's squadron, his correspondence with the Admiralty, the effect which the instructions of his superiors at the Admiralty had on his mind, even the question whether he was actually looking for the German squadron when he sighted it, and not only for an isolated hostile cruiser, are all irrelevant to the point taken in the text. This is only whether, things being as they were when the two little squadrons

to be dwelt on—first for the sake of the admiral's memory, but more because of the judgment passed on him. We all know that Admiral Cradock accepted an engagement with a superior German force off Coronel in Chile, and that he perished in his flagship the *Good Hope*, together with the *Monmouth*. No conduct could have been less consistent with—let us give it the proper name and call it the poltroonery of head which is so anxious to be on the safe side. Was Sir Christopher justified or was he not?

Sir Julian Corbett excuses him, and quotes an eloquent plea made for him by Mr. Balfour. They agree (it would be discourteous to suppose that Mr. Balfour was primed by Sir Julian) in holding that Admiral Cradock may have thought that he could damage the Germans sufficiently to cripple them so that they would be at any rate less able to continue to destroy British shipping, and fall the more easily before other British forces. They are at one also in adopting a tone which was out of place. There is an undercurrent in their pronouncements of something like this. 'He was a brave fellow. His heart was 'in the right place. Let us forgive him, and even belaud 'his valour, though it was too much for his discretion.' We find the apology in every sense of the word impertinent, and the obligatory reference to Sir Richard Grenville absurd. It is a proof of the little we (including the naval officers themselves) care to know of the history of our navy, that any man should think it necessary to go all the way to a sixteenth century product of 'Virtù,' who threw back to the Scandinavian 'berserks,' to find some one he can compare to Admiral Cradock. A perfectly appropriate case in point may be found no further away than in the year 1805.

In February of that year Captain Sir Robert Laurie, of the *Cleopatra*, sighted the French *Ville de Milan* in the North Atlantic. The *Cleopatra* was one of the smallest ships of her type, a 32 gun 12-pounder frigate, carrying 4 carronades—36 pieces of ordnance. The Frenchman was a 36 gun frigate which carried 10 carronades—46 *bouches à feu* in all. Her superiority

met, Sir Christopher Cradock was, or was not, justified in meeting the enemy half way, and whether he ought not to have at least tried to avoid an encounter with a superior force.

of force is estimated by James, a very exact writer, as 7 to 4 when all is allowed for. Here was a plausible excuse for avoiding action with a superior force if Sir Robert Laurie had seen things in that light. He was an average, and therefore the more typical, British post-captain of the time who has not even been thought worthy of an article in the 'Dictionary of National 'Biography.' The French captain, Jean-Marie Renaud, would have avoided a fight if he could, for he had 'a mission to fulfil.' Sir Robert Laurie pursued his big opponent, and compelled him to engage. After an encounter, which the comparative weakness of the artillery of the time, the use of solid shot only, and the tough quality of the fibrous oak planking of the ships rendered a long one, the little *Cleopatra* was battered till she was unmanageable, and had lost a fourth of her crew, killed and wounded. She was then surrendered. But she had not been thrown away. Captain Laurie had delayed the Frenchman, and had done him considerable damage. Because he was delayed he fell in with the *Leander*; he was captured, and the *Cleopatra* was recovered. If Sir Robert Laurie had shown the unwillingness to engage a superior force so firmly enjoined on the naval officers of our day, it is more than probable that the *Ville de Milan* would have been past the spot where she met the *Leander* before she could be stopped, and Captain Renaud might have carried out his mission. Sir Christopher Cradock acted as Sir Robert Laurie had done, and he did well. He needs no excuse, and it will be an evil day for the British Navy—and the British Empire—when the spirit of such officers is washed out by a flood of watery disinclination to take risks.

But he failed. He did not damage von Spee's ships. He did not hasten their destruction. That of course is the substance of the half-veiled condemnation passed on his action. Well, Sir Christopher could but do his best. The power of modern artillery, the destructive action of shells, the brittleness of metal plates when compared to the fibrous quality of wood which tended to close when torn by solid shot, does not allow a modern vessel to survive such a battering as could be endured by the *Cleopatra*. Sir Christopher knew all that, but could not know that his best gun would be smashed at once by the consummately accurate fire of his German opponent. He had good ground to believe that he could inflict damage, and he was trying for the

right thing. The affair of Coronel did stimulate the Admiralty to greater efforts, and did promote the final destruction of von Spee's ships at the Falkland Islands.

It has not been without deliberate purpose that we have dwelt at what may appear undue length on our attempted justification of Admiral Cradock's bold stroke. A war will be what the spirit in which it is directed allows it to be. Though the zeal of subordinates strains against the check, and seeks eagerly for outlets, a Government which shrinks from the prospect of losses will always be able to impose a reserved, a timid, and a dawdling character on the conduct of operations, and that, which was always true, is particularly likely to be the case when submarine cables and wireless telegraphy put it in the power of a Government to interfere at every moment with the most distant squadron. The days are long past when a British admiral, so soon as his sails were below the horizon, was fully master of his fleet, simply because it took weeks, or in Eastern seas months, for a message to reach him. We have very good reason for believing that a meddling and fretful nervousness at headquarters played a great part in the direction of the German Fleets. Whatever may be justly charged against the German officers, no one can honestly say that they were lacking in stomach for the fight. How came it that the High Sea Fleet showed so poorly during the first and second 'sweeps' of the Heligoland Bight? Admiral von Tirpitz in his 'Reminiscences' has asserted emphatically that they were not allowed to act. He says that the Kaiser treated his fleet after the manner of the Russian Grand Duke who hated war because it spoilt the well set-up bearing, the spruce uniforms, and the pipeclay of his soldiers, which he loved to see in all their beauty on the parade ground. The fleet had been a favourite toy for Kaiser Wilhelm and he dreaded to see it knocked about. He kept it in harbour that he might posturise on quarter-decks and talk fustian. Therefore he held it back till the time when it could have hoped to act to good purpose was passed, till the British Fleet had grown to such proportions that no victory the Germans could win would have been effective. The German Fleet slipped accidentally into battle too late. Admiral von Tirpitz writes as an embittered man among the ruins of his hopes, and under the sting of wounded vanity. Yet patent facts do much to justify the substance of his complaint.

That nothing can excuse the rancour which spits at and spurns a fallen master to whom all bowed in the days of his power—well, that tells us something about the magnanimity of Admiral von Tirpitz, but is irrelevant to the conduct of the war. It is plain that the German High Sea Fleet was feebly handled. Are we under the painful necessity of being thankful that it was not allowed to strike hard in time?

This is the question of questions, and we consult Sir Julian Corbett's first volume for the answer. As for all the rest that was going on upon the sea between the early days of August and the end of December 1914, it is full of lively incidents and colour. The threads are many and cross one another. It is difficult to disentangle them. The historian does his best—and it is a well informed and careful best—to arrange the events and to show the relations. He labours to explain how a sharp pull at the net at one spot or the other affected all the meshes. If the impression made on us is not of the clearest, the reader must be asked to bring a little good will, some effort of his own to the construction of the picture on his sensitive plate. The historian who has to record simultaneous movements in consecutive paragraphs is hard pushed. If he yields to the temptation to suspend a story at a point where no natural break exists, and the episodes appear to tumble across the paths, it is only just to remember that if he had preferred to divide his subject in blocks he might have misled and still not have avoided confusion. It is not our intention to make an inquiry whether Sir Julian Corbett is always absolutely right as to this or that reaction of the parts. A critical examination of any one stream of his various narratives would take up a disproportionate space, and the result would not be worth the effort. We may dignify the few months of hunting after the German cruisers in the Indian Ocean, the Pacific and the South Atlantic by the name of operations to secure the command of the sea. In plain truth we were able to hunt for the cruisers because we commanded the sea. An intruder might create destruction for a space but there was only one fate for him. The *Emden* ran the course of any solitary prowler in seas full of enemies. So did the *Karlsruhe*. So did the small squadron of Admiral von Spee. Any one of them might have been stopped sooner, or might have had a longer run. It is conceivable that the *Karlsruhe*

might not have been shattered by an explosion while she was ranging 'the Spanish Main.' If Admiral von Spee had scattered his ships when he entered the South Atlantic, and had set them all to play the *Karlsruhe's* game along the trade routes which run down the west coast of Africa and the east coast of South America, they might have done a great deal of damage. If he had gone over to the African coast with his squadron he might have stimulated the disloyal among the Boers to greater efforts. We do not think he could have done as much harm as Sir Julian Corbett appears to judge. Perhaps one or more of his handful of cruisers might have slipped through the North Sea to a German port. But the destruction of his squadron as an effective attacking unit was inevitable even if he had not rushed on his fate at the Falkland Islands. Half a dozen wolves let loose on the South Downs could no doubt kill a number of sheep before they were exterminated. But their fate could not be long delayed, for the hunters and the guns would be too numerous.

By the very nature of things the naval war was to be decided in European waters. No success in clearing the ocean routes of commerce destroyers, in covering the transport of Colonial contingents, in taking German possessions, would have been other than barren if the navy had failed in the Four Seas of Great Britain, and in the Mediterranean. The Government which directed the war in, and for a time after, 4th August 1914 must be condemned, or applauded, by the answers the evidence constrains us to make to the questions :—

1. Was the navy adequate in numbers, quality, and disposition of its forces to the work it was called on to do?

2. Was it so handled as to allow of the best possible employment of its strength?

Nobody can, we think, be excused for hesitating for a moment to reply in the well-known Parliamentary formula that the answer to the first question is in the affirmative. There is no need to encumber our pages with lists of figures to show that the British Navy was more numerous than the German, and would have been notably superior even if it had not enjoyed the support of the French. Numbers are the least important, as they are assuredly the least honourable, of all the elements of superiority. Better quality is a far greater advantage and one

to be proud of, for it is the fruit of intelligent and strenuous work by officers and men, and not only in the dockyards. But it is not so easy to secure general agreement that it was present. Admirals and generals are rarely satisfied that they were provided with enough, or that they might not have had better. This war has shown no exception to an old rule. A mere reference is all that will be given here to certain mutterings, or even shoutings, of controversy which have been audible since a great ox of censorship has ceased to tread on the tongues of critics. Only this ought to be said. We hold no brief for Mr Winston Churchill, but he is entitled to candid treatment. When he points out to naval officers of rank who have complained of defects in the equipment of the navy that they had themselves been members of the Boards of Admiralty by which it was prepared for 'the day' and must share the responsibility for what failure there was, he does not talk idly. The weary old wrangle over the due share of the expert, and the mischievous influence of the politician, will but too surely never end. We need not lose ourselves in the maze of fallacies, assumptions, ambiguities, and prevarications. The problem is to be looked at as a whole. When we so regard it no fair minded man will deny that the British Navy was sufficiently well appointed to be able to make full use of its greater numbers—even though the Germans may have had a better fuse, and their Admiralty may have given proof of more accurate foresight here or there. And that is quite enough to acquit the Admiralty of the years before the war of blame for neglect. It would have been a damning charge if it could be proved. There is one point on which Sir Julian Corbett just touches, and yet it is one which ought not to be left in obscurity, now when the historian and the writer are free (which implies are under an obligation) to speak openly, and it is this. From the year 1904 at least there had been an expectation—nay more, a strong conviction—among those who were best placed to judge, that 1914 would see an effort on the part of Germany to break down the naval predominance of Great Britain. It was not a mere supposition, a mere guess, but a reasoned estimate of probabilities. A Government which administered the navy without regard to so serious a calculation would have sinned infamously. There is quite adequate proof in Sir Julian Corbett's volume that

successive Cabinets between 1904 and 1914 had not allowed the offence to be committed.

Very few words are surely enough to dispose of the considerations relevant to the proper placing of our fleet in the case of this expected war with Germany. Our estimate of the sense of politicians would have to be low indeed, and our contempt for the intelligence of 'strategists' would surpass Swift's scorn for the 'intellectuals' of generals, if we insulted any Admiralty by assuming that it could find a difficulty in seeing the self-evident. The innocent little animal which Carlyle ranked higher in the scale of intellect than Cardinal Newman, might be trusted to see that arrangements which were best when our enemies sailed from ports to the south of Finisterre would not answer when they started from the east coast of the North Sea. The changes from the ways familiar all through the eighteenth century which we had to make, cannot have called for any strenuous exercise of thought, in so far as the mere disposition of our ships was concerned, nor was there any novelty in them. We had to go back to the conditions of the Dutch wars of the seventeenth century—and to later wars even. Admiral Duncan's blockade of the Texel, and his battle of Camperdown, were neither alien nor remote precedents for the task set to the Grand Fleet in 1914. But all this had been a commonplace from the day that the rapid development of the German Navy began to constitute a recognised menace, and was every bit of it as familiar as his hand to the amateur strategist who cared to take a look at the navy. And there is one remark to be made when we are on the subject of the preparation of the Admiralty. The worst blunder its most acrid critic can find in its management falls far short of the gross miscalculation of the Germans. To set out to build a High Sea Fleet in rivalry with the incomparably greater resources of Great Britain and to neglect the weapon of the weaker side was a proof of crass lack of good sense—or of a superfluity of arrogance. Half as many battleships, and ten times as many submarines would have constituted Germany a far more formidable enemy than she was.

Whether the best was done with the dispositions imposed on us by the nature of the task to be performed—whether the ports to be used by our fleet were all an admiral could have wished—those are problems which come under the head of our second

question. Our position in itself was far better than in the days of our wars with France and Spain. The geographical place of the British Isles does half the work of a blockade of the east coast of the North Sea. The squadrons and single ships which come out from the Heligoland Bight, or any other taking off point at the disposal of Germany, must run into a trap if they turn south. To the north the sea is more open, but even so it is confined in comparison to the whole vast space of the Atlantic which lay open to the French when they started from Brest, or the Spaniards who had got away from Ferrol. A German fleet was doomed to struggle with the tough puzzle imposed on a French fleet based on Toulon when it had to try to pass the Straits of Gibraltar. The French did in a few cases perform the feat. When Boscawen blockaded Toulon in 1759 his fleet was not large enough to allow him to revictual and repair in detachments. He had to take his whole command to Gibraltar—Minorca having been lost at the beginning of the war. Laclue got to sea, and ran past him. Misunderstandings between the French admiral and some of his captains, a division among his ships, and his own hesitations, brought him to disaster in Lagos Bay, but he had reached the Atlantic. Nelson's fixed idea that any French fleet which left Toulon must be bound for Egypt, misled him into giving Villeneuve two chances to clear the Mediterranean, and the Frenchman was able to avail himself of the second. But a French admiral who reached the Atlantic had the western and the well fortified colonial ports of France to provide him with new bases and supplies. If a German admiral had succeeded in slipping through the mouth of the bag between the Shetlands and Norway, he must have known that nothing short of such good fortune as no man out of a lunatic asylum would rely on meeting, or such imbecility on the part of the British Fleet as could not surely be expected, would suffice to save him from total destruction. His way home would have been cut, and where was he to find enough coal? Some damage he might have done—even a good deal—but at an outrageous cost to himself and his country. A Government which had permitted the folly must itself have been crazy. Ventures such as this would have been, belong to the world of boys' books, and the more silly kind of 'Battles of Dorking.' That a German fleet might have made a dash at the Channel or the Atlantic

and might have reached home again is of course physically possible. It is physically possible that all the trumps should be honestly dealt to one player at a game of cards; and they may have been once or twice in thousands of millions of games, but nobody would stake money on the chance of receiving such a hand.

Yet there were times during the war when the German fleet could have delivered shrewd blows. The reason given by Admiral von Tirpitz why it did not may be the correct one—or it may not—or again it may be a part only of the truth. These are questions which concern the Germans more than they do us. We are far more interested in learning whether the opportunities put in their way, of which they failed to avail themselves, were supplied by bad direction on our side. If we commit the mistake of not taking operations in their context, there are occasions when the handling of ships in the North Sea looks rash. We will take as an illustrative case the sweep by destroyers off Heligoland on 10th September 1914—not to be confounded with the earlier action—which at the time was much spoken of as a battle—in the Bight. It was an operation in force with light craft in front, and the Grand Fleet at hand to give them timely support.

'The conditions' (Sir Julian says) 'were ideal for the Germans to accept action close to their base and with full advantage of their torpedo craft. It was a hot, still day, with a haze and glare which brought visibility very low and rendered it impossible for the Commander-in-Chief to control all the parts of the great combination. If ever the Germans had a chance—and a fairly safe chance—of dealing the kind of blow they wanted it was then.'

They did not move. But on the face of it, and as the tale is told the sweep would seem to have been a very rash operation. To give an enemy an 'ideal' opportunity of doing you a damage is not an act which is justified by his failure to profit by the offer. A commander who runs such a risk owes his escape from punishment to the passivity of the enemy, not to any merit of his own. And such tricks are not often played with impunity when the opponent is a serious one. We would prefer to be able to think that Sir John Jellicoe was offering a gambit, endeavouring by the presentation of a seeming advantage to draw the enemy into a position in which he would have suffered.

heavier loss—and that he was ready with his counterstroke. And if he could not, as Sir Julian seems to think, be sure of delivering the answering blow, what was the sense of putting the destroyers into danger? Sir John Jellicoe's critics have been more disposed to accuse him of excessive caution, than to find fault with him for being rash. Yet when we turn to Lord Jellicoe's account as given in his volume on the Grand Fleet, we find a version of this sweep which differs only in wording from Sir Julian's, and it contains this at first sight rather curious passage.

'The conditions on 10th September were very unfavourable for the sweep into the Bight. Thick weather prevailed both before and after daylight, and the visibility varied from two to five miles. The mist prevented the junction of the 4th flotilla with the Battle Fleet for eight hours, a circumstance which would have had awkward consequences had the High Sea Fleet been encountered with its full complement of 80 to 100 destroyers, as might have been the case in such close proximity to German ports.'

An 'ideal' chance given to the enemy to do a damage, and 'awkward consequences' to be looked for if a not improbable event were to happen, rather suggest something tentative, not to say haphazard, in the whole movement. But on this occasion, as on many others, the navy was covering the flank, and generally aiding the operations of the army, and whenever that was the case all legitimate risks were taken without hesitation. An opportunity was offered to the Germans for an effective stroke at the fleet, lest a worse thing should befall the cause of the Allies. It is quite another matter when the chance was given because the fleet was withdrawn from where it could have dealt rapidly with the enemy if he came out, not because the army was to be supported, but because the ships were to be kept safe. We have to recognise that this did happen, and then we feel that we ought to be humbly grateful for the cause, or combination of causes, which kept the Germans from showing more enterprise

It is a reflection not seldom forced on us by the reading of Sir Julian Corbett's history in combination with Lord Jellicoe's 'Grand Fleet.' We find him confessing in one place that as he had to take his ships so far away as to Scapa to coal, the Germans might have found time to intervene, if not with their whole fleet, at any rate with big destroyers in the Channel before he could come back. And of course we hear of that withdrawal

of the Grand Fleet to the North of Ireland which brought with it the loss of the *Audacious* on a mine. Incidentally, as an inevitable consequence of this 'strategic movement to the rear,' the North Sea was left open to the German Fleet. It is sometimes excusable to be bold to, or even over, the verge of temerity —for a sufficient reason. To send the Grand Fleet far to the south of the Channel Soundings at a time when our enemies had a fleet opposite our own shores, was a risk which the British Government did once agree to run. The Duke of Grafton in the 'Memoirs' which were published by Sir William Anson tells how the Cabinet of the day was persuaded to allow Howe to sail for the relief of Gibraltar, at the close of the War of American Independence, at a time when a Dutch fleet was lying in the Texel, apparently in a condition to act. The dispatch of a force strong enough to sweep away the combined French and Spanish squadrons then blocking Gibraltar would leave the British coasts without protection against Dutch insults. Ministers were most reluctant to take the risk, but they were argued into greater confidence by Admiral Keppel, their First Lord. He gave them several reasons why the sending away of Howe's fleet would not be so dangerous a measure as they thought. Some of his reasons were valid only for sailing ships. But one was good for all time. It was that the Dutch could not find out at once that Howe had sailed southward, and before they could discover the truth, Gibraltar would have been relieved, and he would be back. The course of events justified Keppel's confidence. Gibraltar was saved from being starved out, and the Dutch did not 'insult' our coasts. The stake was so important, because the loss of the fortress would have been a terrible blow to the country both morally and politically, that there was a justification for even a gambler's venture. But was the danger from submarines an adequate excuse for the withdrawal to Scapa, and beyond? The relief of Gibraltar was a daring offensive operation. The shrinking away of the Grand Fleet in 1914 has much the appearance of one of those measures of seeming prudence which are practically rash.

The worst did not happen, but was the avoidance due to our management, or to the fact that 'God's Englishmen' (Milton said it and we may quote) have benefited, by no means for the first time, through a special providence? The credit is certainly

not on the face of it due to our wisdom. Why when Rosyth was found not to be ready were the headquarters of the Grand Fleet put in the accessible waters of Scapa a long distance off, and not at Cromarty which is landlocked and easy to defend? Was it because there is a back door to Scapa and none to Cromarty? No doubt this was the reason why the Flow, which had been intended to be used for a minor force only, was promoted to the dignity of headquarters. But it is also a reason suggested by timidity, by a nervous anxiety to avoid loss, by the over caution which in its desire to secure safety diminishes the means of obtaining protection in the nobler way—by defeating the enemy. Extreme caution not uncommonly leads to the adoption of methods which are essentially rash. The officer who tries to protect everything at once ends by protecting nothing. Our good fortune helped us to avoid consequences which might well have followed from the dispatch of the two enormous battle cruisers, *Invincible* and *Inflexible*, to cut short the cruise of Admiral von Spee. Their absence from home waters weakened Sir John Jellicoe still further when he was, as we know on his own authority, already rendered anxious by the development of defects in the machinery of some of his ships, and the presence in his crews of a large proportion of raw men. If Admiral von Spee had scattered his squadron those mighty battle cruisers might well have been detained in distant seas for months and a great risk incurred in home waters. The providence which has done so much for us all through was once more our friend. Von Spee's counsels were 'confounded' and he ran into our hands. None the less there was the rashness of over caution in the decision to send the battle cruisers to do work which might safely have been entrusted to smaller vessels.

The spirit of our officers and men is what it always was save in individual cases, and one short interval of eighteenth-century corruption. Commanders of destroyers, light cruisers, and submarines were never partisans of a too 'scientific' prudence. The extreme reluctance to take risks had its home at the Admiralty and at the top. Even the 'Higher Command' could show decision and play the bold game when it was put on its honour, and it was whenever the army called on it to aid, to flank, to transport the troops. The most satisfactory reading in Sir Julian Corbett's volume is to be found in those passages which

record the 'combined operations.' There was hard work to be done and it was always overtaken. If we look at the difficulty of the task, the strain of the effort to be met, the judgment, tact, ingenuity needed, there was more honour to be won in the transfer of the base of the troops from Havre to St. Nazaire in September 1914 than in a whole campaign of 'brushes' between big British and small German destroyers. Sir Julian Corbett tells the story, and brings out its meaning clearly.

'It was no light task. At Havre and Rouen, besides the various disembarkation staffs, there were, with reinforcements held up there, 15,000 officers and men and 1500 horses, and amongst the vast quantities of stores that had accumulated in the two places there were no less than 60,000 tons of oil, about which the French Government, who on 2nd September withdrew from Paris to Bordeaux, were specially anxious. For the bulk of this our Admiralty had to provide tankers as well as transport for the troops and our own stores, and this was by no means the end of what they had to do for our ally, besides the transfer of our own army base. The retirement towards the Marne had left isolated the French troops at Dunkirk and in the Northern Departments. With the Germans at Amiens, their withdrawal by land was too hazardous a risk and it had to be done by sea. Of the troops at Dunkirk, so many as were not required for a garrison the French were able to embark in their own transports, and to transfer them to Honfleur; but for the rest that lay out in the Departments to the number of 25,000, mainly Territorials, the assistance of the Admiralty had to be sought. It was readily granted, and in due course all were embarked in British ships and landed at La Rochelle. Besides these, 2000 Belgians at Havre, who had been found fit for service, were also carried with 2000 horses to Ostend, and 10,000 French from Calais to Cherbourg, yet our transport Department as usual was equal to the task. In about a fortnight after the word was given, Rouen and Havre, as well as Boulogne, were clear, and by 16th September the last store ship had reached La Rochelle and Bordeaux. In the final six days of the evacuation there had left Havre 20,000 officers and men, 4000 horses, and 60,000 tons of stores. Seeing how heavily the Admiralty was burdened in every other direction, it is a feat to be remembered.'

It is, and we quote it as typical of much done on a larger scale and from first to last. Without infinite work — pure strenuous toil and seamanlike good management which taxed men and ships to the utmost and brought no glory to the doers— the war could not have been conducted nor the victory won. That the praise of the world is too often unjustly distributed is a platitude no doubt. But it is one which needs to be repeated and enforced. The Falkland Islands affair, when a small enemy's

force was crushed by a relatively great one, and that slowly with elaborate precaution, was a holiday game when compared to the long drawn out toil of this drab-coloured transfer of a military base. Sometimes the Admiralty found that the War Office was too exacting in its calls on the navy to help the army. It even had to say 'no' when it was asked to run excessive risks. But there were wondrously few instances of discord. No feasible service which the navy was asked to render was ever left undone. And that is a great honour and a great tribute to the good administration and the good will of the Admiralty.

We have not attempted to make a *précis* of the operations which Sir Julian Corbett tells at length. They are too complicated, too numerous, too full of details which must be carefully noted if they are to be understood, to allow of their being told except in the space which he has at command. The reader must be referred for them to his pages. We do not promise that the perusal of them will be found attractive by all. This history is not a book to be read on a railway journey, or to be run through in an idle evening for amusement. Nor, we are sure, was it intended to amuse. But whoever takes it seriously in hand, reads for the purpose of learning, and, if he finds it helps him so to do, then extracts and rearranges, putting the sections of broken narratives (broken not from clumsiness, but because other narratives of contemporary events cut across them) together for himself, will have all the materials on which to base a reasoned judgment of the conduct of the war at sea down to the destruction of von Spee's squadron, and he will be prepared for what is to come in succeeding volumes in which much which figures in this one will inevitably reappear, with changes in the accidents, names, places, numbers and so forth, but not in the essential character. Every one who has taken the proper precaution to qualify himself to express an opinion is entitled to his own, and will judge for himself. Our own impression is clear, and we can state it in brief space.

Whatever had to be done which was of the nature of 'work,' the transport of troops and co-operation with the army, was thoroughly well executed, and in a style which does great credit to the Admiralty's powers of organisation and its capacity for taking pains. When we get beyond this very important part of its duties we do not find that praise can be given without

some qualification. The officers and men of the navy indeed were full of zeal and courage and were abundantly ready to come to handgrips with the Germans whether by bombarding them on the coast of Flanders or in any other way on land or water. And this we say because some worthy people find a pleasure in seeing it repeated, but not without an uneasy feeling that the praise might quite reasonably be found offensive. The bravery of a British seaman, and the virtue of a lady, are qualities which ought to be taken for granted. To comment on them effusively seems to betray surprise at discovering that they are not absent—which is insulting. When we go on to consider whether the best use was made of the unfailing courage and eagerness to serve of the navy, we find ourselves unable to agree that it was. We have no intention of going into large questions of strategy and tactics. They have a dreadful alacrity in sinking into pure generalities. Almost any measure which can be taken in war can be justified by examples when the historian or critic picks those which suit his purpose and rejects all others. We do not mean that this strategical arrangement was right, and that was wrong, but in the first place that the Admiralty was unduly nervous lest something should occur of a nature to disturb the public, and in the second place that it fidgeted with wireless telegraphy. It would really not be extravagant to affirm that wireless telegraphy has been a positive curse in this war. Over and over again Sir Julian Corbett has to report that a German cruiser took in a wireless message sent by us. He generally could not understand it, but the fact that it was sent told him that British ships were within a certain radius of him, and the discovery was enough to give him a useful warning. And what lies behind the finding of the court-martial which Admiral Troubridge rightly insisted should be held on him after the escape of the *Goeben*?

'The Court found that he had acted in accordance with his instructions, that he was justified in regarding the enemy's force as superior to his own in daylight, and that, although if he had carried on the chase he might have brought the *Goeben* to action in the Cervi Channel, he would not have been justified in quitting the station assigned to him without further orders.

When this is interpreted what it comes to is that Admiral Troubridge who was on the spot and was likely to be a far better

judge of the circumstances than My Lords at the Admiralty was not left free to do his best. We have heard a great deal of the mischievous influence of sea-coast populations and trading interests, which call for particular protection and so spoil the effective concentration of the fleet. But an Admiralty which is in fear for its popularity if the public mind is disturbed by 'disasters' (the favourite newspaper name for such probable incidents in a campaign as a particular lost action), which is therefore nervously anxious to keep on the safe side, and worries its officers with endless warnings not to engage superior forces, messages, orders, and calls for information, may be as pestilent a nuisance as the 'fears of old women' ashore. It is in fact a form of those fears. There was a great deal too much of it all down to December 1914—and there will assuredly be more to follow. If Admiral Troubridge and other officers in the Mediterranean had been left free to take such risks as the British Navy is justified in running and to act unhampered by the Admiralty on their own judgments the *Goeben* might—and probably would—never have reached Constantinople.

DAVID HANNAY.

THE GOVERNMENT AND WAGES

IN 1912 the equanimity of the upper and middle classes in this country was rather unduly disturbed by a publication entitled 'The Miners' Next Step,' published by the unofficial Reform Committee at Tonypandy. This pamphlet outlined a comprehensive programme for the miners, beginning with a national minimum wage of 8s. a day and a seven-hour day, and ending in the control of the industry by the workers. The pamphlet rejected any proposal for nationalisation which, it anticipated, the mine owners would 'loudly call for' when they felt the increasing pressure on their profits.

'Nationalisation (it stated) does not lead to the elimination of the employer, but simply makes a National Trust, with all the force of the Government behind it, whose one concern will be to see that the industry is run in such a way as to pay the interest on the bonds with which the coalowners are bought out, and to extract as much profit as possible in order to relieve the taxation of other landlords and capitalists.'

The events of the past eight years appear at first sight to have falsified the anticipations of the authors of this pamphlet, no less than the alarm which its publication excited. The war led in effect to the nationalisation of the mines; but this has not proved a National Trust at the expense of the miner. On the contrary it has resulted in giving the miner his seven-hour day (with a conditional promise of a further reduction to six hours) and a standard of wages which (after full allowance is made for the increase of prices) gives a real wage in excess of the ambitions of the Tonypandy revolutionaries—both at the expense of the general community. For in 1912 the Tonypandy Committee limited their aims by the extent of the mine owners' profits; they have since learnt to look beyond these profits to the National Exchequer. Such concrete proofs of the efficiency of Government 'control' have radically altered the outlook of the Miners' Federation; and in nationalisation, thus interpreted, not only the miners, but other sections of the industrial population, now find salvation. The steps by which this situation has developed are worthy of consideration.

Before the war the Government was closely concerned with the political influence of Trade Unionism, and in seeking to conciliate that influence the Liberal Party passed the Trades Disputes Act, which set the Trade Unions above the law and placed a millstone about the necks of all future Governments. But apart from its political reactions, the Government was not then much concerned with the settlement of wages; it intervened only in exceptional circumstances when the public interests clearly demanded intervention. The total number of State employees was, before 1914, probably less than three per cent. of the total number of employed persons in the country, and their remuneration could, generally speaking, be regulated without serious fear of political disturbance by reference to the standards prevailing in outside industry ('the Fair Wages 'Clause.'). There was indeed one department, viz., the Post Office, which was becoming recognised as a source of trouble; but whenever the pressure in that quarter became acute, the Government found a way of escape by relegating the problem to a select Committee of the House of Commons. The Hobhouse Committee in 1908 and the Holt Committee in 1914 imposed charges amounting to about two million pounds on public funds; but the expansion of postal revenue was such that the cost could be met without any appreciable raid on the Exchequer. Nor was public opinion greatly exercised by any advantages which the postman secured over his fellow-countrymen, who had not the benefit of a judicial revision of their wages every few years by their accredited representatives in the House of Commons.

Since 1914 the whole landscape has been altered. The prosecution of the war necessitated the concentration of national energies on Government work, and the taxpayer did not grudge the cost provided the goods were delivered. Railways, engineering shops, mines, ships, textile factories, and food supplies—one by one, all the industries of the country were harnessed up to State control. Directly or indirectly, practically all production was being financed by the State; and the State thus for the first time had the duty and responsibility of regulating wages throughout the community.

The situation was not of course foreseen at the beginning of the war; nor if it had been foreseen, would advantage have been

taken of it in the 'union sacré' of national fervour which marked 1914. But that first fine flush of ardour soon grew dim. Symptoms of trouble began to appear early in 1915. The increasing cost of food—and especially of flour—led the Labour Party to table a resolution in the House of Commons calling upon the Government to control commodities and fix maximum prices. The debate took place on 17th February 1915; and Mr. Snowden put the Labour point of view in a nutshell:—

'Do the Government seriously tell us that they cannot do anything in the matter? We are told that it is a matter of supply and demand. I went to the Post Office the other day to buy a penny stamp and I found that penny stamps were still a penny. If the demand for stamps doubled they would still sell at a penny each. Then with regard to railway rates: they have not risen. Why not? Because there we have overcome the operation of the laws of supply and demand.'

Mr. Runciman, speaking for the Government, refused to take heroic measures. He pointed out that the rise in price of the staple articles of food—meat, sugar, flour, etc.—was international, and the only solution he could suggest to meet the resulting hardships was a corresponding increase of wages.

'High prices (he argued) would be of less importance if the remuneration of those who have fixed incomes were raised accordingly. It does not much matter to a man who earns £1 a week now, when he only earned 18s. before, if the cost of living went up 2s. . . . It may be difficult to put down the cost of commodities, and in some directions I say that to have low prices would be a national danger. That can, however, be compensated by higher remuneration. It has been asked, "Have the Government done their best?" I think they have. In the dockyards and the Government works we have raised wages. The recent rise in wages on the English railways will be borne in part by the Exchequer. Wages have been raised in the Armament Companies; it may be they have not been raised enough, but they have gone upwards.'

The absurdity of Mr. Snowden's argument was only equalled by the shortsightedness of the Government reply. The elements of political economy are no doubt difficult to express in Parliamentary language, and the House of Commons seems constitutionally unable to digest them. The whole debate is a melancholy example of the mental catalepsy which afflicts a democratic assembly in the face of an economic problem. However, thus encouraged, the Labour organisations

readily turned their attention to the increase of wages. From this debate indeed started the vicious circle of war bonuses—increased prices being met by increased wages, and increased wages resulting in increased prices—which bids fair to land the country in national and international bankruptcy.

In order that these advances might be considered and conceded, without the dislocation of essential industries by strikes, the Government set up the so-called Committee on Production to adjudicate on claims made by employees in the engineering trades. This Committee granted an advance of 4s. a week to the men in the Clyde district on 23rd March 1915. Similar advances were given — by award or agreement — in other districts. But these advances were obtained in the trades benefited by the war only; one of the flaws in Mr. Runciman's facile solution of the problem was that the increases of wages went to the classes who were least hardly hit by the increase of prices. The engineers (who were working full time and indeed excessive overtime) got the bulk of the advances; the cotton operatives and other classes, whose earnings were curtailed by the war, had to bear the increase of prices, and in addition to contribute in taxation to the advances granted to more prosperous trades. The extent to which war advances were secured depended in fact at this stage on the usual economic factors that govern the ordinary movements of wages.

The skilled tradesmen in the munitions industries were, however, in the position of monopolists, and the ordinary economic laws if allowed to operate would have placed them in altogether too privileged a position—especially when contrasted with that of the troops in the trenches. Accordingly the Government, when it assumed control of the munitions industry by the Munitions of War Act, obtained statutory authority for the awards of the Committee on Production, and as a corollary took power to prohibit strikes. This prohibition proved valueless, for at the first attempt to enforce it—in the South Wales mining industry—the Government had to beat a hasty retreat and concede, under pressure of a strike, what they had refused during the preceding negotiations. The strike was denounced by the *Times* as 'an open challenge not to the Government only, 'but to all government,' but the Miners' Executive stood firm, and within three days obtained practically their full demands. The

penal provisions of the Munitions Act had broken down, and no further attempt was made to put them into operation.

It is difficult to form an unbiased view of this transaction. There is no doubt that any prolonged stoppage of the coal-mining industry in South Wales would have been fraught with the most serious—possibly the most disastrous—consequences to the national safety; and in the face of such possibilities, economic considerations cannot be expected to have much weight. On the other hand, the strike offered an opportunity such as can never recur for testing the effective power of the Government to face sectional wage demands. At no time could the Government have relied so fully and completely on the support of the nation as a whole in its wage-policy, and at no time had it at its disposal such unlimited resources for giving effect to that policy. The strike had not in reality been widespread, and if energetic steps had at once been taken to carry into effect the Munitions Act and suppress intimidation, it might well have proved abortive. Certain it is that the surrender of the Government left a painful impression on national feeling: it indicated a lack of consistency and of determination in dealing with wage problems which was bound to react on the general internal situation. It showed only too plainly that the system of wage regulation set up by the Government with so much elaborate stage management rested on a very flimsy foundation, and that the extent of the advances granted was governed not by the merits of the case but by the power of the claimants. It was only a natural deduction to assume that the whole system was a gigantic bluff operated by the Government and the old-fashioned Labour leaders in collusion, at the expense of the working classes. Its most serious result was therefore to strengthen the hands of the 'extremists' who are always waiting, in the surging welter of Labour politics, to spring out and denounce the older and more respectable Trade Union leaders at the first display of 'weakness.' The effect was to undermine the influence of the older generation of Labour leaders in the later industrial upheavals.

The settlement in South Wales was the first indication to Labour of the new conditions of employment. Here was an employer who could not afford a lock-out and could therefore be 'squeezed' as required. Labour from that day was master of

the Government, and knew it. To its credit, be it said, Labour for a time was at least as moderate in its use of this power as a private employer in the same position would have been. The Committee on Production continued to deal with applications for advances on a local and sectional basis throughout 1915 and 1916, and its awards, though moderate, were accepted as adequate. Following the principle that the war bonus was primarily intended to mitigate the hardships of the worst paid workers, who had little or no margin to meet the increase of prices, the Committee consistently adopted the principle of granting a flat rate advance, separate from ordinary wages, thus avoiding any proportionate increase to the higher paid grades. As a consequence of this policy the total increase of wages granted by the Committee to the beginning of 1917 amounted to 7s. per week, as against an increase of 87 per cent. in prices, according to the Board of Trade statistics. Up to this date indeed the machinery for regulating wages had probably operated in such a way as to restrict the extent of the advances obtained by the men within far smaller limits than they would have reached under the ordinary conditions of collective bargaining.

With the formation of the Lloyd George Government in December 1916, Government control rapidly increased in extension, and the scope of the war wage advances spread proportionately. But the shortage of labour, consequent on the fuller operation of the Military Service Acts, accentuated the intensity of the demand, and the rate of the advances granted became disproportionately accelerated. To this process the Government lent its support, partly from a desire to mollify the suspicions with which Labour had viewed the formation of the new Government, and partly, it appears, from a genuine ambition to improve the economic position of the working classes. The Government at the same time undertook a belated but successful effort to restrict the rise of prices of essential foodstuffs by the introduction of a system of rationing, and initiated a less commendable, though perhaps inevitable, innovation in the matter of the bread subsidy. The effect of this double policy was to throw a very heavy burden on the national purse, and to accentuate the depreciation of the currency. Financial considerations were, however, at this stage of the war regarded as of

secondary importance, and political economy was thrown to the winds.

In pursuance of the new policy the Committee on Production in March 1917 granted a national advance of 5s. a week in the engineering trade, and arranged to hear further claims at intervals of four months. Accordingly a further 3s. was granted in the following August, so that within eight months the increases in the engineering trade had more than doubled. The Committee refused any advance during the following winter, taking account of the 12½ per cent. bonus granted by the Government, but in August 1918 they conceded an additional 3s. 6d. Their functions were thereafter transferred to the Ministry of Labour, which granted a further 5s. in December 1918.

But the Committee was not allowed any monopoly in the regulation of wages; nor were its awards the most disturbing element in the industrial situation. Under the system of dilution, a certain proportion of skilled men were employed at time rates in setting up machinery for the 'dilutees,' and discontent was provoked by the higher earnings obtained by the latter. The Minister of Munitions decided in October 1917 to grant a bonus of 12½ per cent. on earnings to meet this grievance. But he did not confine the new bonus to the comparatively limited number of skilled men who could not be placed on piece work, and the 12½ per cent. was granted to *all* time workers. The result was an immediate agitation for a similar increase in piece rates, and in the end this was settled by an advance of 7½ per cent. in those rates. The grant of this percentage bonus represented a definite departure from the policy of granting flat rate advances pursued by the Committee on Production. Apart moreover from the lack of co-ordination shown in this respect, the action of the Government was conspicuous for its failure to achieve the end in view. A little consideration would have shown that any advance to meet the special cases in mind must be very strictly defined, or it would rapidly spread to all other classes of workmen, as in fact it did. This episode made it clear that, in dealing with wage increases, the departments concerned were less careful than the Committee on Production in its awards. That Committee tried to correct the mistake which had occurred by refusing the next application from the engineering trade, but

it had to grant a further 3s. 6d. to men and 2s. 6d. to women in August 1918. Again however the Government intervened, and to placate the demand for equal payment to men and women, actually *increased* the award of its arbitrators as regards women from 2s. 6d. to 5s. The action of the Ministry of Munitions in these cases rendered it difficult to regard the Committee on Production as anything but a court of first instance from which appeals could be made to the executive, with the result that its authority was weakened and its usefulness impaired.

To sum up: during 1914-1916 an increase of 7s. was granted to the engineering trades to meet a rise in prices of 87 per cent.; but during 1917-1918 further increases, amounting to 20s. plus 12½ per cent. of earnings, were granted to meet a further rise in prices of only 43 per cent. In addition large indirect benefits, such as the bread subsidy, were granted professedly in order to relieve the pressure for wage advances. As regards the railwaymen the Government had retained the negotiations in its own hands, but a very similar course was followed in their case—the increase to December 1916 being 10s., and the subsequent increases to December 1918 being 23s., the bonus being converted into 'war wages' in 1917. A similar policy was adopted by the respective Controllers in the mining and shipping industries, which gave large increases independently of the Committee on Production.

Directly or indirectly therefore it may be said that the years 1917-1918 mark a definite transition from the method of organised bargaining between employers and employed, and the assumption on the part of the Government of responsibility for settling wages in the main industries throughout the country. Such intervention was no doubt unavoidable, during a period when these industries were subject to Government control, but it had the disadvantage of divorcing wages from the ordinary economic influences, upsetting the relativities between the trades working on Government account and those which still continued on private work, between skilled and unskilled labour, and between men's and women's wages, and increasing the financial burden of the nation by a very substantial amount.

After the armistice it might have been expected that the Government would either have taken immediate steps to divest itself of all responsibility for wages, or that it would have

obtained the necessary powers to institute an effective control over wage demands. This however was not a policy which commended itself to the sectional interests of Labour, and these interests were still able to exert great pressure on Government policy. In the first place, they obtained legislation providing that the advances secured during the war should be continued. The provision enabled the trades which had been adversely affected by the conclusion of hostilities to retain the benefits resulting from the abnormal conditions during the war, while it enabled those which had languished during the war, and now resumed full activity, to level up their wages to those of the war industries. As a complement to this 'upstandardisation' a system of unemployment benefit was introduced which took away any incentive to the less industrious elements of the population to obtain and to retain work.

The inevitable consequences have been a further increase in prices and a reduction of output. Meanwhile, very extensive improvements have been conceded by way of reductions of working hours—which in some cases will probably prove economically justified, but in other cases throw a wholly excessive burden on the consumer or on the taxpayer. Finally, the Government has now on foot an elaborate programme, which includes the continuance of the Wages Regulation Act, the institution of a permanent Court of Arbitration, the statutory limitation of the hours of employment and the establishment of minimum wages throughout the country.

In all these matters the Government has felt bound to 'set 'an example.' One of the first steps taken by the Lloyd George Cabinet was to divest the Government of responsibility for fixing wages for the Civil Service by setting up a special Arbitration Board for Government employees. But while it relegated the wages of its direct employees to this Board, the Government reserved to itself the more troublesome questions in regard to other public services, and it met each case that arose by adopting any solution which appeared expedient, with a fine disregard of consistency or of consequences. The pay of the Navy was referred to a committee of naval officers, which awarded itself rates far in excess of anything justified by the circumstances—especially when 20,000 demobilised officers were stated to be unemployed—and the example set by the Navy

spread to the Army and Air Force. The miners' demands were submitted to a Royal Commission, which, despite a few reputable members, was constituted and conducted its proceedings in such a manner as to forfeit all claim to public confidence, and which dealt with the conditions in the mining industry as if they could be divorced from the general wage position of the country. Again, under pressure of sedition, the Government hurriedly conceded a minimum wage of 70s. a week to the Metropolitan police force; and a Parliamentary Committee, observing the success of this stratagem, extended the concession to the constabulary throughout Great Britain, without regard to differences in the nature of their duties and in the cost of living in the various districts in which the men are employed.

As a result of such measures of 'reconstruction' last year not only had all profits from State-managed industries been swallowed up in wages, but the railways, the mines, and the postal service were all dependent on subsidies from the Exchequer. Now it is not a matter of much importance for the nation to carry *one* subsidised service at a loss, but it obviously cannot afford to do this for all industries. Public opinion became restive, and the Government's attention was drawn to the financial position by its former press supporters. When therefore the railwaymen came to demand their share of public generosity, the Prime Minister met them with an empty purse. He offered what would have been a fair arrangement if, in dealing with the miners, the police, and the fighting services, the Government had adopted a similar attitude. But the inconsistency of trying to reduce pay in one trade, while giving a permanent increase in others, was too glaring, and a strike followed. The Government this time maintained a firm attitude, and, assisted by the legitimate public resentment at the suddenness with which the trouble had been precipitated, it organised the essential national services so successfully that, after a week of public anxiety, the strike was called off and negotiations were resumed. As a result of concessions on both sides, these negotiations have since been carried to a successful conclusion, and the agreed settlement arrived at on this important question is the most hopeful augury of future industrial peace.

The embarrassments of the Government, in its dealings with directly controlled labour, were not mitigated by the movements

of wages in industries which were not controlled. Once the turn over to peace industry had been accomplished, a period of booming trade was inevitable, in order to meet the clamorous demand for goods throughout the world. Industrial wages would naturally have tended to rise. But the process was accentuated by the fact that in many markets the Government was still competing. This was especially the case in regard to the building trade. As a result of the embargo on new construction during the war, an enormous amount of building was required for commercial and industrial purposes; and the prospective profits to be reaped were such as to make the builder reckless of cost. At the same time, social conditions made it imperative for the Government to push ahead with a gigantic housing scheme financed by the Exchequer. The result was to produce cut-throat competition for the necessary labour and materials. Immediately after the armistice the Government took control of the prices and destination of materials; but in regard to labour it long professed its helplessness, and the operatives naturally took advantage of the situation.

It has been stated that another 250,000 men could be absorbed in the industry to meet the unprecedented demand. But the building trade has too frequently had bitter experience of long periods of depression and unemployment, and it is peculiarly conservative in its antagonism to dilution and in its observance of rules in regard to output. It was in no mood to speed up the programme by admitting a quarter of a million additional fellow workers to compete for a bare livelihood as soon as the war arrears had been accomplished. So for the time being the bricklayers and the plumbers became monopolists, and the employers (many of whom were working on 'time and line' contracts) vied with one another in offering increases of wages to attract labour. Finally the Minister of Health, as a counsel of despair, decided to offer a bonus of £150 for every house built during the next year—which means that (assuming 100,000 houses to be secured) the taxpayer will have to shoulder an additional £15,000,000 of permanent debt, besides an unknown further liability in respect of insolvent schemes put in hand by municipal authorities. When things had come to this pass, the Government obtained power to restrict 'luxury' building, and stated that it would make a further effort to secure a freer use of

semi-skilled labour, and it may be hoped that these measures, though belated, will ease the situation. But the damage already done cannot be remedied, and the large advances obtained by the building trade from its employers have caused a fresh cycle of wage advances in industry generally.

Such is the fruit of the happy-go-lucky policy which has been pursued in dealing with labour during the past four years. The workers in each industry are encouraged to press their rival claims, without reference to the financial condition in which the country has emerged from the vast expenditure of our accumulated resources in the Great War. Each section which is in a position to extort an advance, whether from the Government or from private employers, has been taught to use its power to the full, and any advance obtained by one section becomes a lever for fresh demands from other sections. In the trades directly controlled by the Government—the mines, railways, and post office—the demand is for the distribution among the operatives, first of all of profits arising from the industry, and then of further resources from the Exchequer. The doctrine of Tonypandy still holds good, and profits — whether they accrue to the State or to private employers or capitalists — are equally regarded as so much spoliation of the working classes.

Yet out of profits must be found, first, the necessary capital for the maintenance and development of industry, and secondly, —so long as our present system of taxation remains unaltered— the bulk of the public revenues of the State. The dissipation of profits in wage increases means industrial paralysis and national bankruptcy. Our civilisation depends on the constant accumulation of reserves out of a surplus of production over consumption. These reserves may be built up either by the State or by private thrift; but without them the framework of our elaborate social existence will collapse. An appearance of prosperity can be obtained no doubt by eating up what is left of the accumulated reserve which we as a nation had amassed before the war; but such prosperity is short lived and will bring a bitter retribution swiftly at its heels. A very small improvement in the standard of life of the working classes, without any increase in production, will make the total available reserve vanish into thin air, and if this process is brought about by penal taxation or confis-

cation of private capital, it will inevitably prevent any similar accumulation of private wealth in the future.

If, then, the development of private thrift is to be sapped by State action, its benefits must be replaced by State action. The State will have to tax not only for current but for capital expenditure, and every increase of wages will have to be followed automatically by an increase of taxation. So far however is this from being recognised, that the appropriation of profits by the State is regarded as, if anything, more heinous an offence than their accumulation by private individuals ; and there is no little danger that, if the present tendencies continue, the private capitalist will pull down with him the solvency of the State. First, public opinion insists that a larger and ever larger share of profits shall be appropriated to fill the deficit in the national Exchequer : then the employers, in the vain hope of saving their own position, adopt the easy compromise of handing over to their workmen the profits which anyhow they will not be allowed to retain. But soon, finding no release from pressure, constantly threatened alike by increases of taxation and by increases of wages, they will gladly exchange their precarious dividends for a guaranteed income, thus finally handing over to the State the liabilities of the industry without any of its assets.

A Labour Government, no less than a capitalist Government, will have to face this dilemma ; and some at least of the Labour leaders appear to have a clearer conception of the essential need of capital—however raised—than some of its quondam defenders. But in encouraging proposals for the nationalisation of industries n the interests of the operatives, they are treading a dangerous path which will lead them nowhere. The Labour Party, if it is to assume the responsibilities of government, will have to rise above the sectional views to which it has become habituated, and take account of the national interests as a whole. These may well be reconciled with the nationalisation of key industries ; but it will have to be nationalisation managed on very different principles to those (in so far as there have been any) which have actuated the Government during the past four years, and which the clamant advocates of nationalisation apparently desire to perpetuate.

Nationalisation, as at present understood, offers no solution to two of the greatest industrial problems : (*a*) the relation of

wages to profits; (*b*) the relation of wages in one industry to those in others. Both these problems are at present viewed by the nationalisers from a purely sectional standpoint. If the State is effectively to control wages, it must find a solution for these problems on a national basis, and the experience of the past three or four years suggests that there are three indispensable conditions required before this can be accomplished:—

1. The Government must adopt a considered and consistent wage policy.
2. It must control industry.
3. It must control labour.

To secure consistency, the Government must not relegate the demands of this section or of that to independent tribunals, each of which will settle the case before it after an investigation conducted in blinkers (and nowadays expedited by a time limit). Still less can the Government refer some cases to such tribunals and settle others itself. The duty of dealing with all wage claims must be concentrated in the hands of one authority, and this authority must be the accredited instrument of the Government, interpreting the considered policy of the Government and backed by all the force of the Government.

But such a tribunal cannot have regard only to persons employed on national services. It must decide the relativities and fix wages for the operatives, *e.g.*, in the cotton trade or the building trade no less than in the mining industry or in agriculture. The Government cannot fix the wages of half the population on *a priori* principles and leave the wages of the others to adjust themselves. If private trade booms, the wages of Government employees will rise in sympathy and they cannot be kept down; but there is no necessity for the wages of Government employees to decline if outside trade suffers depression. Ultimately therefore the standard of wages set by the nationalised services (with the Exchequer behind them) will be a constant source of friction to the rest of industry. If the Government is to regulate the wages of women in Government service (as suggested in the Report of the Committee on Women in Industry) by moral (or political) instead of economic considerations, it must see that the same principle is applied throughout the country. If wages and conditions of service in

the railways or the telephone department are not to be settled with reference to a profit and loss account, neither should they be in any other industry. The tribunal must therefore take over control of all industries, and it will have to determine the relative scales of payment which should be allowed to each.

To secure this however it must be free to move surplus labour from one industry to another, and it cannot allow a shortage to be created by trade union restrictions. And, above all, its decisions once made must be binding: any attempt to override them by a strike, or even a threat of a strike, must be countered as 'a challenge to all government.' So we require, to complete the process on which Labour is embarked, a fully developed system of State socialism, which will allocate to each industry its part in the national life and to each individual his place in the industrial system. There will no longer be any place for the private interests either of trade unions or of employers: both alike will be swallowed up in an autocratic and omniscient Ministry of Industry or Labour which will be the universal employer. Nothing less than this can resolve the inconsistencies which result from the present division of responsibility between private employers and the Government.

Such a system has never yet been tried (except possibly in Russia, where the conditions are so obscure that no satisfactory conclusions can yet be drawn). We can however safely say that it is extremely improbable that a cumbrous machinery of this kind could achieve as economical results as the present industrial organisation manages, despite its many defects, to secure. Admittedly the proposal requires to be judged, not only by reference to its merits or demerits from the economic standpoint, but also by reference to the prospect it offers of establishing a more ordered and contented society in the country that adopts it. Judged by this criterion also it is never likely to succeed, for it involves the replacement of the human employer, who can deal with individual men and measures on the spot, by an impersonal and inhuman machine which works, and can only work, by fixed rules of thumb. Such a substitution is not likely to commend itself in the long run to Labour any more than to Capital. For Labour in its present mood appears to appreciate personalities better than principles.

The Government has indeed demonstrated to all classes its incompetence to execute the task of regulating wages during the war, and it is improbable that any future Government will have any better success. What, then, is the alternative? We cannot simply set back the clock and leave labour and industry to fight their battle out over the corpse of our national prosperity. During the transitional period, till trade is normal, some degree of Government intervention is no doubt necessary. But it should be directed in such a way as to end as soon as possible the vicious circle of national advances based on the cost of living, and to restore in each industry the vital inter-relation between wages and production. The working classes are already coming to realise that the Eldorado they were led to expect after the war rests upon their own efforts to realise. Disappointing it is no doubt to find our castles in the air vanishing, but such disillusionment is the best thing for the country. Enough and too much has been said of the New Earth to come, and too little has been spoken of the difficulty of maintaining even the Old Earth that we once lived in. The tumult of the internecine struggle of Europe is past and we are able once again to take stock of the situation. Wherever we turn, we find that the waste must be made good if we are to recover the lost ground. We are all poorer in that we have consumed our patrimony and we shall have to set to work to build it up again.

The working classes may no doubt suffer less than the capitalists in that they have less to lose; but for that same reason they will be the first to suffer. The printing of paper money may enable their nominal wages to be doubled and trebled; but they are already discovering that they cannot feed their families on paper money. Just because the working classes are, as they boast, the backbone of the nation, the restoration of their economic position depends on their own efforts, and no juggling with profits or with capital can effect it for them. At present they have pinned their faith on nationalisation and, unless that faith can be shaken, nationalisation is bound to come. It is no good fighting a delusion with threats: its falsity must be demonstrated. The first real measure of reconstruction must be to let in the light, to clear away the debris of ineffectual promises, and to educate the people to an appreciation of the real economic position. We need a radical alteration in the

outlook and psychology of Labour before any practical measures can have much effect.

Labour will no doubt retort that if it needs a wider vision the employer needs a moral regeneration. Certainly the employer must play his part in the rebuilding of the nation; but the first move in the new game rests with Labour. The employer in this country is powerless to exploit Labour in the manner that was possible half a century back, and with the disappearance of his power he can no longer be a convincing villain of the piece. Indeed so conscious is he of his weakness, that he scarcely dares to attempt any justification of his existence, and he has almost come to the point of 'loudly calling 'upon' the State to put him out of his misery by the latest device for euthanasia. But the State, as experience has shown, is equally helpless, and its attempts at control are universally unpopular. It is for Labour to define with greater clarity its objectives. Does it want to supersede the direct management of the private *entrepreneur* by the phantasmagoria of innumerable State Departments, none of which can accept direct responsibilities? Does it not rather aim at securing for the workman a greater share in the management of industry and a more assured position in the social system of which he is the life? And if so, is not this aim more likely to be attained by other means than the creation of an irresponsible bureaucracy?

Great Britain has in her people the best workmen in the world, and, provided that they are satisfied with their lot, there need be no apprehension about the future of our country. The old methods of industrial warfare have served their purpose and are now become a danger to the classes which they were intended to protect. The future line of development must follow a different course. Its keynote should be copartnership, in the fullest sense of the word: the workers must take their share in the responsibilities, as well as in the profits, of management. They must be given a greater security for their livelihood, but if this claim is to be met, they must be ready to withdraw the present restrictions on output which are the natural result of precarious employment. Only by the encouragement of the fullest production in every branch of industry can the standard of living in the country be raised; but given this pre-requisite, there is no reason why the New Earth should not eventuate.

Nationalisation is a mere alteration in the design of the coping stone: production is the keystone of the whole edifice.

The leaders both of industry and of labour are well aware of the crucial need for increased production, but unfortunately their efforts to bring this need home to the rank and file have been lamentably unsuccessful. Their attitude is largely dominated by the inveterate suspicion—too often justified by the event—that increased production means increased profits but reduced wages. No crusade for increased output will make any converts till some method of correlating pay and production more closely can be established. Its introduction is made peculiarly difficult at the present moment by the continued separation from wages in many industries of the so-called 'war 'bonus,' which makes a large part of the earnings of the ordinary workman dependent on the cost of living. The separation is apparently intended to enable this element of wages to be reduced in the future, and from that point of view it naturally provokes resentment and unsettlement in the minds of the workers. It is highly problematical whether any such reduction will ever be effected—apart from a change in the industrial situation—and it seems therefore a questionable policy on the part of employers to impede industrial reconstruction by standing out for it.

The first practical measure towards the resettlement of industry is the consolidation of these war wages. Their continuance or adjustment (upwards or downwards) could then be made dependent not on the caprice of any statistical sliding scale operated by some unknown deity in the Board of Trade, but on the capacity of the producer in each trade to compete with his commercial rivals in the world markets. If the Government and the employer frankly took this line—accompanying it with measures for a minimum wage and provision for unemployment on the one hand, and for scientific taxation of excessive profits on the other hand—a great deal of the present suspicion would disappear and the path would be clear for the revitalisation of industry. The employer could materially assist by giving the fullest consideration to the development of Whitley Councils which, up to the present, have proved a sickly and artificial growth, but which may yet take root if they are honestly accepted as a step in copartnership, and if they are organised

by the industry concerned without interference from outside. The Government can best co-operate by ceasing to compete in industry and by restoring self-government to each trade, assisting them all, in its proper function, by the rehabilitation of the public finances. Wages will then, gradually, adjust themselves to economic circumstances much as they did before the war, except that the prosperity of the employer will be recognised as linked up with the prosperity of his employees; and Government intervention can be restricted to preventing the exploitation of the public either by one or the other, or by both in collusion.

If this alternative is adopted, arbitration will still have a place — in a retired niche of the industrial edifice. Where employers and employed cannot adjust their differences completely but are within sight of a settlement, an arbitrator can split the difference. During the past five years this has been the position. Wages have been advancing, and the only question was how much should be conceded. Once this process stops however arbitration will become unpopular with the working classes and thereby ineffective. The ultimate principles on which industry will be governed cannot be referred to arbitration and must be settled either by the executive Government or by direct negotiations (through Whitley Councils or otherwise) between the employer and the employed; and such negotiations, even if they lead to some troubled years, offer a more hopeful prospect for the future than any attempt to regimentalise industry.

DISCONTENT IN INDUSTRY

1. **Industrial Conference. Report of the Provisional Joint Committee.** Cmd. 501. 1920.
2. **Declaration of Supreme Council of the League of Nations on the Economic Conditions of the World.** 8th March 1920.

AT the Industrial Conference, convened by the Government on the 27th February 1919, to consider the then increasing unrest in industry, likely, it seemed, to come to a head in a miners' strike, there was appointed a Joint Committee of Employers and Trade Unionists to report on the causes of the unrest. The Report of that Committee has at last been published. It consists of two parts: first, the compromise recommendations of the Joint Committee; and secondly, a valuable appendix containing a memorandum on the causes of and remedies for Labour unrest from the point of view of the Trade Union representatives on the Joint Committee. It is a most interesting document, and deserves careful study by every person who desires to appreciate what is fundamentally wrong in industry.

The recent decision of the Trades Union Congress, on 11th March last, makes it imperative for every one to understand the outlook of Labour, however different from one's own. It will be remembered that the Congress decided against Trade Union action in the form of a general strike as the official means of enforcing nationalisation of the coal mines, and resolved on intensive political propaganda in anticipation of a general election. The doctrinaire theories that prevail amongst a large section of the community which does not come into personal touch with Labour and has no actual experience of its point of view, are frequently so egregiously wrong in assigning particular causes to certain symptoms of industrial unrest that the study of the Report of the provisional Joint Committee is all the more essential. My experience has driven me to the view that one of the most potent causes of unrest is ignorance, both on the part of the employer and of the workpeople, of the ordinary truths of economics. In previous articles in the EDINBURGH REVIEW, I

have made my point as to the injurious effect of economic fallacy on co-operation and also production in industry. The purpose of this article is to indicate the economic issues connected with the different causes which contribute to industrial discontent.

It is much to be regretted that the prevalent definition of economics is the 'science of wealth,' a phrase which goes far to prejudice its importance in the minds of many workers. If Professor Marshall's definition could be more universally used, that economics is the study of mankind in the ordinary business of life, it would go much further to commend the science to popular acceptance. There is a further bar to the popularity of economics: the attempt of so many economists to divide the sphere of economics sharply from that of sociology, ethics, or politics. Every one who has had experience in industry knows that although you may postulate that economics deals with the material wants of man, with his efforts to satisfy those wants and his satisfaction when they are supplied, there is hardly an instance where any person engaged in industry, be he employer or workman, is not influenced, sometimes almost uncontrollably, in his attitude to or conduct in industry by stimuluses and forces which the academic economist would certainly refuse to recognise as economic. The truth is that, with our present complex organisation of industry, and with the increasing education, mental outlook, and culture of the working classes, all sorts of forces are at play producing contentment or discontent in industry, the very existence of which was not suspected, even ten years ago, whether in economics, sociology, ethics, or politics.

There are apparently people yet who say that contentment in industry implies something approaching stagnation, that is to say, a condition of things which betokens to the superficial observer complete acquiescence in existing conditions; that conception probably accounts for the unhappy phrase 'industrial 'unrest.' But industry, to be healthy, can never present the tranquil appearance of a summer sea; there must be perpetual surface evidences of the continual efforts on the part of all sections to better their conditions in life, to advance their welfare, to secure the satisfaction of their aspirations. Nor would any person who desires to see a contented and progressive country try to curtail the workers' attempts to progress, subject

only to one dominant consideration; there must be an accepted principle of industrial evolution based on definite recognition of the respective functions which each factor in production and each person engaged in industry plays, with common agreement that industry is one of the highest forms of national service, and that the chief end must ever be the greatest possible contribution to the common welfare of the whole community. Persons who rail against the efforts of the workers to improve their lot frequently forget a further fact. In the past it has only been on its own initiative, and by reason of its own action, that Labour has, speaking generally, obtained increased wages and improved conditions of employment. These things have not, in the main, been spontaneously conceded by employers, and so in the future, there can be no public objection whatsoever to the same course of procedure being followed, provided that Labour takes a long view, fully recognises its duties to the nation, and does not attempt to advance its sectional ends by selfish disregard of the interests of the community of which it forms a part.

The Trade Union memorandum annexed to the Joint Committee's Report sets out the following as the chief causes of industrial unrest:—

(1) Lack of any comprehensive industrial or economic policy on the part of the Government or employers.
(2) The increasing demand of the workers for a real share in industrial control.
(3) The high prices prevailing for commodities of common consumption.
(4) The universal opinion among the working classes of the prevalence of extensive profiteering.
(5) Unemployment and under-employment.
(6) Inadequate wages and earnings.
(7) Excessive hours of labour.
(8) Want of more and better housing accommodation.
(9) Inadequate recognition of Trade Unions.
(10) Lack of adequate machinery capable of giving constant expression to the co-ordinated demands of the whole of the workers.
(11) Delay in the settlement of industrial disputes.

While these are the detailed causes immediately responsible for industrial unrest, the memorandum contains one or two significant paragraphs which profess to reduce all the discontent to a common origin:—

'The fundamental causes of labour unrest are to be found (so it runs) rather in the growing determination of labour to challenge the whole existing structure of capitalist industry, than in any of the more special and smaller grievances which come to the surface at any particular time.

'These root causes are twofold—the breakdown of the existing capitalist system of industrial organisation, in the sense that the mass of the working class is now firmly convinced that production for private profit is not an equitable basis on which to build, and that a vast extension of public ownership and democratic control of industry is urgently necessary.

'The second primary cause is closely linked with the first. It is that, desiring the creation of a new industrial system which shall gradually but speedily replace the old, the workers can see no indication that either the Government or the employers have realised the necessity for any fundamental change, or that they are prepared even to make a beginning of industrial reorganisation on more democratic principles.

'The changes involved in this reconstruction must, of course, be gradual, but if unrest is to be prevented from assuming dangerous forms, an adequate assurance must be given immediately to the workers that the whole problem is being taken courageously in hand. It is not enough merely to tinker with particular grievances, or to endeavour to reconstruct the old system by slight adjustments to meet the new demands of labour. It is essential to question the whole basis on which our industry has been conducted in the past, and to endeavour to find, in substitution for the motive of private gain, some other motive which will serve better as the foundation of a democratic system. This motive can be no other than the motive of public service, which at present is seldom invoked, save when the workers threaten to stop the process of production by a strike. The motive of public service should be the dominant motive throughout the whole industrial system, and the problem in industry at the present day is that of bringing home to every person engaged in industry the feeling that he is the servant, not of any particular class or person, but of the community as a whole. This cannot be done so long as industry continues to be conducted for private profit, and the widest possible extension of public ownership and democratic control of industry is therefore the first necessary condition of the removal of industrial unrest.'

The memorandum then indicates what Labour means by the reorganisation of industry on democratic lines. Mines and the supply of coal, railways, docks, and other means of transportation, supply of electric power, and all shipping, so far as ocean-going services are concerned, are to be 'nationalised' immediately. There is to be great extension of municipal ownership, acquisition by the State of all key industries, and elimination of all private profit from the manufacture of armaments. Recognising however

that neither nationalisation nor municipalisation necessarily results in the workers obtaining any greater control of industry than under present 'capitalistic' conditions, there is added a further demand that both shall be accompanied by a guarantee to the organised workers of the greatest practicable amount of control over the conditions and the management of the industries in question.

The Government's proposal for conferring upon the workers a voice in the control of industry is embodied in the Reports, generally known as the Whitley Reports, of the Sub-Committee of the Reconstruction Committee appointed to consider the relations of employers and employed. There are five Reports: the first, dated 8th March 1917, dealt with the more highly organised trades; the second, with partly organised and unorganised trades; the third, with the establishment of Works' Committees; the fourth, with conciliation and arbitration; and the final Report with consequential matters.

The scheme of the first Report was the establishment in each industry of a national council, and of district councils, representative of the Trade Unions and of the Employers' Associations in the industry, and of Works' Committees, consisting of representatives of the workers and of the management in each workshop. The questions to be determined were the general principles to cover conditions of employment in the industry, including wages, having regard to the need for securing to the workpeople a share in the increased prosperity of the industry; the establishment of regular methods of negotiation; the means of securing to the workpeople the greatest possible security of earnings and employment; the methods of fixing earnings, piece prices, etc. The Report recommended the establishment of a Trade Board in the unorganised industries in substitution for the national and district joint councils.

While large sections of moderate labour have accepted the principles of the Whitley Reports, it cannot be said that any of the militant sections are prepared to forego their demand for the elimination of the capitalist from industry in return for the benefits under the Whitley scheme of organisation. The National Guilds League, which is undoubtedly one of the foremost of the labour organisations in its attempts to mould opinion, and which aims at the abolition of the wage system, and at the

establishment of self-government in industry through a system of national guilds working in conjunction with the State, in contradistinction to the Marxian revolutionary project of Syndicalisation, has criticised adversely the Whitley scheme. It objects strongly to the Whitley recommendations in favour of national councils, because it says all advance towards control of industry must spring upwards from the workshop, or rank and file movement. It further contends that, since the joint committees, of whatever sort they are, must be composed of two sides with opposite interests and opposite aims, there cannot in any real sense be joint control. There then follows this significant passage:—

'It is equally important that the representatives of Labour should maintain a complete independence . . . and that they should use their position in the councils not in order to improve relations between employers and employed, or seek even to increase the efficiency of Labour, but solely to press vigorously the movement for the securing to Labour of control over production and industry generally.'

It will therefore be seen that the two essential matters which labour places in the forefront of its programme are—firstly, the abolition of the present capitalistic organisation of industry; and, secondly, the securing to the workers of control over production and industry generally. The method by which the first end is to be achieved is nationalisation or municipalisation. While that in itself would satisfy the State-Socialist school of labour, it is only regarded by the more advanced schools as opening the door for the promotion of their particular schemes of industrial control by the workers — whether in the shape of the proletariat organisation of the extreme Marxian left of labour, or the organisation of industry in guilds comprising the manual worker, the technical, administrative, and clerical workers, advocated by the national guildists.

Although I have never found much defined opinion amongst the ordinary workmen in the workshop as to what the ideal organisation of industry ought to be, I have found in many shops, as a result of Socialist propaganda, a strong objection to working for the profit of an employer. That expressed itself early in the war. The Committee on Production, as early as February 1915, drew the attention of the Government to the fact that with the gradual rise in food prices workers were protesting against

Government contractors being entitled to unlimited profits. The need for limiting profits in the interests of industrial peace was emphasised a seeond time in the fourth Report of that important Committee, issued 5th March 1915.

All sorts of schemes were considered by the Government for limitation of profits, and particularly for giving the workman a share in excess profits. Referring to this, Lord Kitchener said in the House of Lords, on the 15th March 1915 :—

'Labour may very rightly ask that their patriotic work should not be used to inflate the profits of the directors and shareholders of the various great industrial and armament firms, and we are therefore arranging a system under which the important armament firms will come under Government control, and we hope that the workmen who work regularly by keeping good time will reap some of the benefits which the war automatically confers on these great companies.'

Mr. Runciman, who was at the time President of the Board of Trade, prepared, early in 1915, a most sagacious scheme for giving workmen a share in excess profits, which Lord Kitchener no doubt had in mind when he made his speech ; but unfortunately, because of the opposition of the great armament firms, the Government abandoned the idea. I have always thought it a most regrettable capitulation. Without doubt, had the principle been instituted then, as it could have been under the patriotic impulses of the war, much of our wages trouble during the war and since could have been avoided. As it was, the subsequent limitation of profits contained in the Munitions of War Act, 1915, which was the outcome of the arrangement between the Government and the Amalgamated Society of Engineers of 25th March 1915, was a miserable substitute, irritating and unjust to many employers, operating frequently to the detriment of the consumer, and depriving labour of any incentive to production.

At present one of the commonest objections of the workman to increasing output, or to the introduction of machinery, or the use of time or labour saving appliances, is 'Why should 'I do this and assist in increasing output merely to swell the 'profits of the capitalist?' That brings us to this point: Has not the time come when we have got to test and see whether there is anything in the obsession of so many workmen that the capitalist can be eliminated from industry, and that his

disappearance would be attended with benefit to production and advantage to the State? I have discussed this up and down the country on many occasions during the war, but the old unsuccessful socialistic experiments to push the capitalist out of the picture fail to carry conviction now. It would be of immense national value if only some practical experiment could be tried to put to the acid test of experience whether his room is better than his company. The workers are quite alive to the fact that co-operative production is almost certain to prove a failure. They further realise that if an industry nowadays is nationalised, the failure or the costs of the failure fall, not upon the producers, but upon the country and the public, and that undoubtedly is one of their motives for attempting to use nationalisation as a basis for the elimination of the capitalist. While certain sections of the workers think that better wages could be secured from the Government under nationalisation, very large sections are convinced of the detriment to the worker of anything in the nature of rigid bureaucratic administration. Deep down however at bottom is the idea in many men's minds that the capitalist is merely living on the worker, and the sooner he is abolished the sooner will the worker receive a greater remuneration in the shape of the share which the capitalist now appropriates. What we have definitely to establish if we are to secure the progress of industry is a precise knowledge of what, after the removal of the capitalist and his replacement by the State, would be the conditions in any industry, and if so in what industries the change would be of direct advantage to the workers, the consumers, and the general public. Little real knowledge on this vital question will be gained so long as each party to the controversy merely contents itself with flinging catch words and abuse at the other side.

The following extract from 'Socialism and Syndicalism,' by Mr. Philip Snowden, M.P., states the aim of Socialist labour.

'The aim of socialism is to get rid of the payment of interest and profit. As the instruments of production pass more and more into the hands of the State there will be less and less need for borrowing for the further extension of State enterprise. The opportunities of investment of private capital will be constantly getting more restricted, and the rate of interest will naturally fall. Only when the community owns practically all the great sources of wealth production, will interest disappear, for

when there are no openings of private capital for profit no one will want capital, or be willing to pay interest for its use.'

Is this a condition into which we can afford to have our progressive country plunged? That is the fundamental question.

High prices and the belief that profiteering is rampant are undoubtedly the cause of much Labour unrest. It is hardly an over statement to say, that in the mind of the average worker every high price is due to profiteering. If commodities are so scarce as to be unobtainable, the worker says that some capitalist is holding up the supply so as to corner the market and make his price. If raw material is not coming forward and works accordingly have to be shut down or put on short time, this is not due to the effect of the war or difficulties of transport, but entirely to the machinations of some calculating capitalist. If the cost of living is increased so as to subject the worker to undeniable hardship, this again is solely attributed not to the results of the war, the destruction of wealth, the restriction of cultivation, the diminution in output, but solely to the capitalist who, from some cussedness in his nature, prefers to make a small turnover by selling a limited number of things at a high price than a large turnover by selling a much greater number at a lower price. In fact it is not straining the truth to say that there is hardly any evil, real or imaginary, that is not at the present moment laid to the charge of the profiteer. In emphasising these facts, I am not to be understood as suggesting that there is not a considerable amount of profiteering on foot, and that a large number of persons are not deliberately engaged in exploiting the country in its time of necessity, and battening on the needs of its inhabitants for their own selfish enrichment. But having regard to the growing volume of industrial unrest directly due to the belief of the workers in the prevalence of profiteering, it is the plain duty of the Government to take every possible step to lay the matter before the public in its due proportions. Anything is better than the progress of the snowball of industrial resentment, which every week is growing in volume and may shortly assume the proportions of an avalanche.

Under such circumstances the declaration of the Supreme Council of the League of Nations on the 'Economic Conditions

'of the World' is a document of unmistakable importance. The facts contained in it and the principles it inculcates should be disseminated widely amongst the workers. It clearly shows that the remedy proposed by the Trade Union memorandum, namely that the only way of keeping down prices is by putting production and distribution in the hands of the public itself, so that the price can be fixed at such a level as to be fair in the aggregate, and so that gains and losses can be distributed over the whole supply of each product, does not even touch the fundamental causes of high prices. I make bold to say that not one single cause of the several assigned by the Economic Council for the present high prices is accepted by the rank and file of industry.

The Supreme Council, after a careful survey of 'the vitally 'urgent problem of high prices in all its aspects,' makes a number of recommendations. First, that the Government should give immediate attention to the execution of all measures which will contribute to the full resumption of peaceful industry, to the encouragement of better output on the part of the workers, to the employment of machinery and means of transportation, and to the removal of such disturbing factors as profiteering. They further point out that it is essential that early steps be taken to secure the deflation of credit and currency by the reduction of recurrent Government expenditure within the limits of revenue, by the imposition of such additional taxation as is necessary to secure this result, by the funding of short term obligations by means of loans subscribed out of the savings of the people, and by the immediate limitation and curtailment of the note circulation. One passage of special importance occurs in the Supreme Council's memorandum: 'In regard to industry generally, each 'Government must take steps to impress on their people that 'the limitation of production directly assists the upward move-'ment of prices, and that it is by increasing production that they 'can best help to solve the problem.'

This truly is one of the urgent morals of the moment. The workers do not realise that by restricting production and increasing scarcity they are affording an opportunity to profiteers to plunder the country. The worker would express himself as entirely in favour of the recommendations of the Supreme Council for private economy, but he will contend that only the

capitalist classes come within the ambit of the recommendations. He will not agree that 'it is only by means of frugal living on 'the part of all classes of the nation that capital can be saved 'which is urgently required for the repair of war damage and for 'restoring efficiency to the equipment of industry on which future 'production depends.' The Supreme Council urges that in order to secure the rehabilitation of Europe as a whole and of each constituent country, every individual must contribute his best efforts to the restoration of his own country. That indeed is the lesson which has to be pressed home, and none of the recommendations in the Trade Union memorandum are likely to achieve that end.

The Trade Union memorandum undoubtedly reflects industrial psychology in attributing to the fear of unemployment a large amount of the prevalent labour unrest. There is nothing which casts so deep a shadow upon the ordinary working class household as the spectre of unemployment or under-employment which is always looming in the background. In my experience, few employers deny that provision ought to be made for unemployment, either by preventing it where possible, or by relieving it when it occurs. The advanced sections of labour say, quite erroneously, that the capitalist system depends upon unemployment; by this they really mean the assumed power of the employer to pay low wages and employ cheap labour. However this may have been in years gone by, it certainly does not apply to-day with district rates prevailing in every important industry. The real difficulty about unemployment and under-employment is how it is to be prevented, and when it has occurred how it is to be mitigated. The Trade Union memorandum recommends the allocation of Government contracts in such a way as to steady the volume of employment and the co-ordination of orders given by local authorities; in addition it suggests the institution of a scheme of unemployment provision applying to all workers on a non-contributory basis for the maintenance of unemployed and for supplementing the earnings of those who are under-employed, and they urge that the scheme should be administered directly through the Trade Unions. One much more doubtful proposal is made, namely, 'that a general increase in wages, by improving the purchasing 'power of the workers, would have a permanent effect in the

'direction of limiting continuous unemployment by bringing 'consumption up to something more like equilibrium with 'production.'

Arising out of the recommendation of the Joint Committee, the Government has introduced into Parliament its Unemployment Insurance Bill. It is an extension of the compulsory insurance provisions of the National Health Insurance Act, 1911. That Act dealt only with the building, shipbuilding, and engineering industries, more or less as an experiment; the Bill applies to practically all workers with the exception of those engaged in agriculture and in domestic service. At the date of the Armistice four million people were insured under the Act of 1911, and the extended Employment Insurance Scheme under the Act of 1916. The new Bill will bring the insured workpeople up to about twelve millions. The scheme is on a contributory basis. As the Bill was introduced into Parliament each workman will pay 3d. a week as compared with the old 2½d. Women will pay the same contribution as before, namely 2½d. The employer will pay the same sum in each case as the worker, and the State will give a quota of one-third of the joint contribution. The benefits to men will be 15s. per week as against the old 7s., and to women 12s. per week, the women for the first time receiving a smaller benefit than the men. Boys and girls will pay 2d. and 1½d. respectively per week, and their benefits will be 7s. 6d and 6s. respectively per week.

The Government scheme, while it is accepted by the moderate sections of labour as well intended, and a real attempt to meet the problem, is scouted by advanced sections as an 'insult'; the figure of 15s. a week benefit is ridiculed. In the view of moderate labour a duty ought to be imposed upon each industry of providing for its unemployed and under-employed, and I do not suppose much objection would be raised to this by the majority of employers if labour would undertake to give a fair day's work for a fair day's pay, and increase output. The Bill enables an industry to contract out of the Government's general scheme and form a special scheme for itself. Moderate labour also takes exception to the contributory nature of the scheme, and contends that the provision for unemployment should be wholly met out of the profits of the industry, and to no extent at all out of the wages of the worker.

On the other hand, true to their refusal to recognise in any form the necessity of the capitalist, advanced labour contends that the duty of providing fully for all unemployed or under-employed persons should fall upon the State, and be met out of the proceeds of general taxation without any recourse to contributions from the workpeople. This contention is supported on the alleged duty of every State to find work for every citizen, or failing that, to provide in money for his maintenance, and the many 'right to work' Bills introduced into Parliament by members of the Labour Party before the war afford interesting illustrations of valiant efforts to effect the impossible. One of the advantages claimed by the Syndicalist for his proletariat organisation, and by the National Guilds for their proposed consolidation of industries into comprehensive guilds, is that in both cases the maintenance of unemployed and of under-employed will form a first charge upon the industry. It is a very real necessity that the problem of unemployment and under-employment should be approached in the most generous manner possible, so far as is economically practicable. Without any question the fear of unemployment operates to restrict output, and to prevent the development of industry on modern progressive lines. This is most especially noticeable in all forms of casual employment, especially where the terms of engagement are for a day or less; there it is a common occurrence to see work that could be easily done in a day or half-a-day deliberately protracted so as to run into the next day or half-day so as to secure a further spell of work.

The whole subject and basis of wages, as the Trade Union memorandum truly points out, is one of potent effect on industrial unrest. There are many theories of wages current amongst labour, even amongst those who recognise that wagery is not slavery and represents a condition which cannot in essence be abolished under any system either of private enterprise or public ownership. In practice claims by labour for increased wages are made upon one or both of two grounds, either in respect of the increased cost of living, or to entitle the worker to attain to and maintain a higher standard of life.

It has been customary during the war to estimate the average increase in the cost of maintaining the pre-war standard of living of the working classes on the basis of the monthly *Labour*

Gazette figures. These figures consist of two kinds: firstly, retail prices of food; and secondly, prices of food combined with rent, clothing, fuel, light, etc. The average percentage of increase in retail prices is arrived at by taking a standard budget, assumed to represent the normal working class consumption of food commodities in 1914, and then working out the increased cost of each of these commodities on the basis of current prices over prices in July 1914, afterwards applying a series of 'weights' to get the comprehensive percentage. The average percentage increase for food prices, rent, clothing, light, fuel, etc., are obtained taking the percentages of the increased cost on retail prices of food and the percentages of increased cost of the other items referred to above, applying these weights: food, $7\frac{1}{2}$; rent (including rates), 2; clothing, $1\frac{1}{2}$; fuel and light, 1; other items included, $\frac{1}{2}$. This latter figure is that commonly known as the 'increase in cost of living' figure. Labour leaders have always attacked these figures on the ground that they are not sufficiently comprehensive, and do not include a number of necessary items of household expense, the favourite illustrations being household utensils, furniture, etc. In March 1920 retail prices of food were 133 per cent., and food, together with the other items in the cost of living, 130 per cent. over July 1914. It was shown by Lord Sumner's Committee on the 'Cost of Living,' that the increased cost of living for the working classes as recorded by the Board of Trade figures was considerably above actual facts; the Board of Trade showed for July 1918 109 per cent.; Lord Sumner's Committee ascertained the true figure was 74 per cent.

But there is discernible in labour a growing sense of the futility of trying to enable wages to overtake prices by the simple expedient of periodic advances. It is realised that, so far as members of the working class are working for one another, a rise in one industry is secured at the expense of another, and only so far as the poorer sections of the population are providing commodities for the richer, is an advance in wages not necessarily effected at the expense of other workers. In the case however of a general advance in wages, it is being appreciated that the effect is merely to cause a general increase in prices. Output is being more and more realised by enlightened sections of labour as the only true means of improving the purchasing power of money and so reducing the cost of living, and that output can

be furthered by systems of payment by result fair to the employer and to the worker. The extremist however propounds to the ordinary workman this dilemma :—

'True, he says, output will probably assist yourself in securing an advance in real wages, but at the same time, it will assist your employer more by increasing his profits, and therefore it is your duty as a loyal member of the industrial movement unselfishly to refrain from bettering yourself in order that you may assist in abolishing the capitalist.'

But quite apart from the effort to secure advances to meet the increased cost of living there is a growing desire on the part of the workers to secure increased wages for the purpose of advancing their standard of life. It is a mistake for any person to think that the outlook of the worker, especially in regard to culture, is the same as in 1914. It has enormously widened, and there is amongst many sections a pathetic longing for a better and broader outlook and a personal participation in those things that satisfy the soul. The fact however is overlooked that one of the true conditions of progress is that the means of satisfying one's aspirations should be somewhat less than the measure of the aspirations themselves, otherwise there would be no stimulus forward. The war has shown that where wages were advanced in many sections of industry beyond the immediate needs of the then existing standard of life it was reflected in lost time, diminished output, and slackness ; the worker found he was able to maintain his standard of life by less effort on his part, and he not unnaturally did so. In time education will remedy this, but the process is a slow one.

The length of the working day, as the Trade Union memorandum shows, is closely related to discontent in industry. Before the war, hours were in many cases excessive. They are now much shorter, and much greater opportunity is afforded the worker for home life and self-improvement. I can testify from personal experience that very many workmen are using to high advantage the facilities for a 'fuller time' which they now enjoy, and education will increase their capacity to do so profitably. A 47-hour week has now been introduced into the engineering and shipbuilding industries, and a 44-hour week into other industries, for example dock labour, and again a 48-hour week in still some other industries. The Government is introducing a Bill to prescribe, subject to certain qualifications, a maximum 48-hour

week in industry. But of course extremists are agitating for a 30, 32, and 34-hour week in many cases. If hours are to be reduced in this way, the worker must work the full time of the shortened working day. This unfortunately he is not doing in many cases, and a greater proportion of the shorter day is now wasted through lost time and absenteeism than before the reduction of hours; and even during the time now actually worked, the rate of output is less than during the time actually worked in the old working day. This is a most serious national problem, and Trade Unions are not tackling it as they should. To insist on collective bargaining, then make an agreement securing great advantages for the worker, and then treat that agreement merely as 'a declaration of the minimum conditions' because it is unenforceable at law, and not enforce it on their members, is surely not worthy of any great Trade Union. If there is no legal duty to employers there is a moral duty to the community.

Enough has been said to indicate the vital urgency of each member of the community studying for himself or herself the causes of industrial unrest. If the greatest of them are to be settled through the medium of the ballot box, it is the plain duty of every elector to ascertain their plain meaning and clear consequences. The country wants and is prepared to see that justice is done between employers and employed and is ready to deal with the extremist who seeks to use industrial discontent as a handy means to precipitate his 'social revolution'; but knowledge is essential.

LYNDEN MACASSEY.

No. 473 will be published in July 1920.

INDEX

Titles of Articles are printed in heavy type

Aberdare, Lord (Henry Austin Bruce), 135
Activity—the will to action, 289 *et seq.*
Adderley, Rev. Canon, 18 *et seq.*
Adriatic Question, The Peace Conference and the, 209-31
Alexander I., Emperor, 146
Alexandria, Physiologus of, 340-51
Allenby, Field-Marshal Lord—Syrian campaign, 115 *et seq.*
Almayer's Folly, 321
America, United States of. *See* United States
Anabaptists, 2
Anglo-American relations — **England and America,** 251-62; failure of British envoys to understand America, 252; appointment of specialist to Washington Embassy advocated, 253; value of propaganda, 256; influence of Irish Question, 257; development of personal relations urged, 259
Annunzio, Gabriele d', 223 *et seq.*
Anti-British feeling abroad—The Legend of 'Perfide Albion,' 143 *et seq.*
Apuleius, *Golden Ass*, 27 *et seq.*
Arabs—problem of Syrian administration, 130
Autobiographies, Some Feminine, 303-17

Bailey, Crawshay, 136
Bailey, Philip James, 310
'Balance of power' in Europe, The, 152, 235, 238
Balfour, Mr. A. J.—and Admiral Sir C. Cradock, 358
Balfour, Dr. Andrew—on public health in Egypt, 125
Barclay, Mr. Colville, 255
Barère, 145
Barker, Ernest, **The Calcutta University Commission,** 97-114
Bashford, Major Lindsay, **Egypt and Palestine,** 115-33
Bashkirtseff, Marie, 306
Beaconsfield, Lord (Disraeli), 162
Bedford, Duke of, *Science and Fruit Growing*, 263
Bengal—education: Calcutta University Commission's Report, 98
Bentinck, Lord H. Cavendish, 6
Berkeley, Bishop, 88
Berlin, Congress of (1878), 163
Bestiaries, 349
Bird-Watching as a Hobby, 63-77
Bismarck, 162
Blackbirds, 71
Blair, Sir David Hunter, 303
Boigne, Comtesse de, 306
Brace, Mr. William, *quoted*, 204
Bradbury, Sir John, *quoted*, 169
Brahms, 310
Bridgeman, Mr. W. C., 6
Bruce, Henry Austin. *See* Aberdare, Lord
Budget (1909), 166
Building trade — Government's labour policy, 384
Burchett, Josiah, 353
Bureaucracy, 204
Burney, Fanny, 305
Butler, Samuel, 45-62
Butler, Canon Thomas (Samuel Butler's father), 52

Calcutta University Commission (1917-19), The, 97-114
Canning, George, 156
Canterbury, Archbishop of, 5

Capital and labour—Socialist misconceptions as to, 17; position in Wales, 134-142 *passim*; **Discontent in Industry**, 393-408
Carlill, Mr. James, **Physiologus of Alexandria**, 340-51
Castlereagh, Lord, *quoted*, 153
Christian Church—early conception of the Incarnation, 342; of the descent into Hell, 342; of the Resurrection, 343
Christianity—relation to politics, 2 *et seq.*
Christianity and Industrial Problems, 5
Church and Socialism, The, 1-25
Churchill, Mr. Winston, 363
Church Socialist League, 5 *et seq.*, 15
Civil Service—limitations of permanent system, 203; setting up of special Arbitration Board for Wages, 382
Clemenceau, M. — and the Adriatic Question, 219 *et seq.*
Cleopatra—action with *Ville de Milan* (1805), 358
Cleric-Scientist, An Eighteenth-Century, 78-96
Coal-mining—
  Nationalisation—arguments against, 196, 205; *The Miners' Next Step*, 374
  Royal Commission, evidence before, 186-208 *passim*
  South Wales dispute (1915), 378
Cole, Mr. G. D. H., *quoted*, 205
Committee on Production, 377 *et seq.*
Compston, Rev. H. F. B., *The Magdalen Hospital: The Story of a Great Charity*, 78
Consciousness, 286, 287, 295, 296, 300
Conrad, The Novels of Joseph, 318-39
Corbett, Sir Julian; *History of the Great War: Naval Operations*, Vol. I., 352-73
Corfu, Declaration of (1917), 218
Coronel, Battle of, 359
Cox, Mr. Harold—**Nationalisation**, 186-208
Cradock, Admiral Sir Christopher, 357
Crawford, Sir Richard, 254
Cuckoos, 74
Cunningham, The late Archdeacon, *quoted*, 11
Curle, Mr. Richard, *Joseph Conrad*, 318, 324, 332, 337
Curtis, Sir Roger, 357

Dalmatia, 215 *et seq.*
Dannreuther, Mr., *quoted*, 169
Dartford warblers, 72
Davidson, Most Rev. Randall T. (Archbishop of Canterbury), *quoted*, 5
De Castro, J. Paul, **An Eighteenth-Century Cleric-Scientist**, 78-96
Dino, Duchesse de, 306
Diplomatic service—criticism, 253
Discontent in Industry, 393-408
Disraeli, Benjamin. *See* Beaconsfield, Lord
Dockwra, William, 192
Domestication, 298
Driault, M. Edouard, *quoted*, 144
Drunkenness—gin traffic (*circa* 1734), 82

Earthquakes in England, 90 *et seq.*
East Anglia—fruit growing, 265 *et seq.*
East Malling Experimental Fruit Station, 272
East, Middle—present and future administrative problems, 115-33
Economics, 7 *et seq.*; 393-408
Egerton, Mr. H. E., *British Foreign Policy in Europe*, 148
Egypt—
  Civil Service—admission of Egyptians, 126
  Economic effects of recent campaigns, 119 *et seq.*
  Egypt and Palestine, 115-33
  Public health, 125
  Reforms, overdue, 125
  Revolutionary disturbances (1919), causes of, 121 *et seq.*
  Wealth, increased, 126
Egyptian Expeditionary Force—method of recruiting Labour Corps, 123

Elliot, Mr. Arthur, *Traditions of British Statesmanship*, 149
Elliot, Hugh, **Bird-Watching as a Hobby**, 63-77
Ellis, Henry, 87
End of the Tether, The, 333
Engineering trade—Government's labour policy during the war, 381 *et seq.*
England and America, 251-62
Erewhon, 49 *et seq.*
Ernle, Lord, **Latin Prose Fiction**, 26-44
Erskine May, Sir Thomas. *See* Farnborough, Lord
Europe—balance of power in, 152, 235; prospects of a new 'Concert,' 238
Evans, Mr. David—memorandum on State mining in Germany, 199

Fables, 340
Farnborough, Lord (Sir Thomas Erskine May), *quoted*, 166
Feminine Autobiographies, Some, 303-17
Fieldfares, 70
Fielding, Henry, 88
Fisiologus, Liber, 349
Finance, national—
  Parliamentary control, system of, 166-85
Fire prevention, 90
First Phase at Sea, The, 352-73
Fiume Question, 223 *et seq.*
Food control, 200
Food, cost of—debate in House of Commons (1915) recalled, 376
Foreign Office—methods of diplomatic appointments criticised, 252
Foreign Policy—**The Legend of 'Perfide Albion,'** 143-65
Fothergil, Richard, 135
Foster, late Sir Michael, *quoted*, 81
Frederick William IV., King, 147
Fruit farming—**Science and Fruit Growing**, 263-83; prospects of the industry, 265; acreage under fruit, 268; value of research, 271; Woburn experiments discussed, 274; flowering, 274; biennial bearing, 275; manuring, 276; pruning, 278, 279; planting, 278; effect of grass on trees, 281
Fyffe's *Modern Europe, quoted*, 232, 245

Galileo, 352
Garnsey, Sir Gilbert, *quoted*, 170
Gaunet, 75
Gentz, Friedrich von, 152
Georgia, founding of, 82
Germany—
  Anti-British feeling before the war, 143
  Coal-mining industry—results of State management, 198
  'Encirclement,' alleged policy of, 143, 164
  Navy—**The First Phase at Sea**, 352-73
  State railways, 195
Gibraltar, Howe's relief of, 370
Gibson, Sir H. J., 169
Gin traffic (*circa* 1734), 82
Gladstone, late Mr. W. E., 150
Glastonbury—S. Hales' exposure of constituents of supposed medicinal waters, 92
Gneisenau, General, 146
Goeben, escape of the, 372
Golden Ass of Apuleius, 27 *et seq.*
Golden-crested wrens, 69
Gooch (G. P.) and Masterman (J. H. B.), Messrs.—*A Century of British Foreign Policy*, 149
Gorizia-Gradisca, 215
Gosse, Mr. Edmund, 308, 310; **Samuel Butler**, 45-62
Government and Wages, The, 374
Grand Alliance, The, 154
Greece—the 'dark ages,' 350
Green, Canon, *quoted*, 21
Green's *Lectures on the Principles of Political Obligation, quoted*, 240
Gregory, Professor—supplementary note to Calcutta University Commission's Report, 113
Grenville, Sir Richard, 356
Grey, Lord (Sir Edward)—and the Adriatic Question, 218

Guy, Mr. J. H., *quoted*, 170
Gwynn, Mr. Stephen, **The Novels of Joseph Conrad**, 318-39

Hæmastatics, 80
Hague Conventions, 242
Hales, Rev. Stephen, **An Eighteenth-Century Cleric-Scientist**, 78-96
Halifax, *quoted*, 150
Hall, W. E., *quoted*, 246
Hannay, Mr. David, **The First Phase at Sea**, 352-73
Harris, Sir Charles, *quoted*, 169 *et seq.*
Hatton, Mr., 274
Headlam, Dr., *quoted*, 19
Heart of Darkness, The, 334
Hegesias, 350
Heligoland, destroyer action off (September 10, 1914), 366
Henson, Rt. Rev. H. Hensley, **The Church and Socialism**, 1-25
Herbette, M., *quoted*, 144
Hereford, Bishop of, **The Church and Socialism**, 1-25
Herzogenberg, Frau von, 316
Hickey, William, 304
Hildesley, Bishop Mark, *quoted*, 93, 95
Hjort, Johan, *The Depths of the Ocean*, *quoted*, 294
Hobbies, 63
Hobhouse, Sir Charles, 179
Horden Collieries, 196
House of Commons—powers over finance discussed, 167-85
House of Lords—right to withhold assent to money bills, 166; effect of Parliament Act, 167
Howe—dispatch to the relief of Gibraltar, 368
Humming-birds, 67

Incarnation, The—early conception of, 342
Inchcape, Lord, *quoted*, 197
India—
  Education — Calcutta University Commission's Report, 97-114
Industrial Conference—Report of the Provisional Joint Committee, 393
Industry, Discontent in, 395-410
Interest, 142
International Law, The Future of, 232-50
Ireland—influence of Irish Question on Anglo-American relations, 257
Irish News Bureau, 262
Istria, 215, 226 *et seq.*
Italy—British sympathy with Italian unity, 161; Adriatic Question, 209-31

Jam—relation to fruit growing, 268
Jays, 74
Jellicoe, Admiral Viscount, *The Grand Fleet*, 1914-16, 352 *et seq.*
Jerusalem—Field-Marshal Lord Allenby's campaign, 116 *et seq.*
Jones, Mr. Henry Festing, *Samuel Butler, Author of 'Erewhon'*, 45 *et seq.*
Joyce, Mr. Herbert, *The History of the Post Office*, 191

Keeble, Prof. Frederick, **Science and Fruit Growing**, 263-83
Kent—fruit growing, 265 *et seq.*
Kestrels, 74
Kingfishers, 68
Kitchener, late Lord, *quoted*, 399

Labour—
  Coal-mining—conditions in South Wales, 134 *et seq.*; representative pay sheets, 140; dispute in 1915 recalled, 378
  Discontent in Industry, 393-408
  Freedom of contract: effects of the rise of industrialism in South Wales, 136
  Hours, reduction in, 407
  Machinery—reasons for objection to introduction, 141, 399
  State employees — increase in number, 375
  Unskilled labour — motive for demands for increased wages, 138

Wages — wrong inferences drawn from high wages paid in State controlled industries, 188 *et seq.*; **The Government and Wages**, 374
Lansbury, Mr. George, 6, 15
Latin Prose Fiction, 26-44
Lawrie, Capt. Sir Robert, 358
Lawrence, Dr., *The Society of Nations*, 232-50
League of Nations, 232-50 *passim*; declaration of Supreme Council on economic conditions of the world, 406
Lehmann, The Life of Liza, 303-17 *passim*
Leo XIII., Pope, *quoted*, 20
Liberty—the element of liberty in all life, 288
Liberty of the subject—effect of the industrial movement in Wales, 137
Life—the will to live, 285
Living, cost of—labour discontent caused by, 376, 395, 405
Lloyd George, Mr. D.—and the Adriatic Question, 219 *et seq.*; labour policy, 279 *et seq.*
London, Declaration of, 242
London, Treaty of (1915), 217
Lord Jim, 324, 328
Law, Mr. A. Maurice, **England and America**, 250
Luther, 351

Macassey, Sir Lynden, **Discontent in Industry**, 393
Macaulay, Lord—speech on Ten Hours' Bill, *quoted*, 10
Machinery — labour's attitude: Welsh miners' attitude, 141
Manuring, 276
Marriott, Mr. J. A. R., **Parliament and Finance**, 166-85
Marshall, Dr. Alfred, *quoted*, 8, 23
Masterman, Mr. J. H. B., *A Century of British Foreign Policy*, 149
Mimicry, 296
Miners' Next Step, The, 374
Ministry (Lloyd George)—labour policy, 379 *et seq.*
Montagu, Lady Mary Wortley, 96
Montesquieu, 145, 151
Morgan, Rev. J. Vyrnwy, **Industrialism in Wales**, 134-42
Munitions of War Act—Government's powers in respect of labour, 377

Napoleon Buonaparte—and the legend of 'Perfide Albion,' 146
Nationalisation, 186-208; **The Government and Wages**, 386; **Discontent in Industry**, 393-408
Nationality, persistence of the spirit of, 245
National expenditure — Select Committee's Reports discussed, 167; Parliamentary control, 166-85; value of 'estimates,' 169
Nature, The Will in, 284-302
Navy—operations in the Great War: **The First Phase at Sea**, 352-73
Nero, the Emperor, 29 *et seq.*
Nightjars, 73
Nitti, Signor, 229
Nostromo, 335
Novels of Joseph Conrad, The, 318-39

Oppenheim, late Dr., *The League of Nations*, 232-50 *passim*
Origen, 343
Outcast of the Islands, An, 322
Outpost of Progress, An, 333
Owls, 73

Palestine — Field-Marshal Lord Allenby's campaign, 115 *et seq.*; economic and social effects, 119 *et seq.*; Occupied Enemy Territory Administration, 127
Palestine Military Railway, 517
Palmerston, Lord, 157
Parasitism, 298
Parliament and Finance, 166-85
Parliament Act, 166
Pauli, Charles, 55 *et seq.*

Peace Conference — **The Peace Conference and the Adriatic Question**, 209-31
'Perfide Albion,' **The Legend of**, 143-65
Peters, Dr. Emil, *Der griechische Physiologus und seine orientalischen Uebersetzungen*, 340
Petronius, 27 *et seq.*
Phillips, Professor W. Alison, **The Legend of 'Perfide Albion,'** 143-65
Physiologus of Alexandria, 340-51
Pickering, Mr. Spencer, *Science and Fruit Growing*, 263
Pitt, *quoted*, 150
Plotinus, 350
Political economy, 7 *et seq.*
Politics and religion—inter-relation, 2
Polk, Mr., 227
Ponsonby, Lord, 157
Pope, 84
Porphyry, 350
Post Office—origin, 191; results of State management discussed, 191; wages of employees, 375
Poverty, 13
Power—the will to purpose, 295
Prest, Mr., 196
Prices, high—debate in House of Commons (1915) recalled, 376; labour and, 401
Private enterprise, 186-208 *passim*
Profits—limitation, 399
Profiteering, 402
Propagation—the will to propagate, 286

Railways—
Nationalisation, arguments against, 195
Ramsay, Professor, 344
Redwings, 70
Reformation, the Protestant, 3
Religion and politics—inter-relation, 2
Renaud, Capt. Jean-Marie, 359
Resurrection—early conception of, 343
Richardson, Miss Dorothy, 314
Richardson, Samuel, 95
Robespierre, 145
Rousseau's 'Confessions,' 305
Roxburgh, Mr. Ronald F., **The Future of International Law**, 232-50
Royal Society of Arts—foundation, 93
Runciman, Mr. Walter, *quoted*, 376; scheme for giving workmen share in excess profits, 399
Russell, Lord John, 161
Ruyter, Admiral de, 356

Sachs, Julius von, *quoted*, 81
Sadler, Sir Michael — Calcutta Commission's Report, 97
Savoy prison—ventilation in 1749, 86
Satyricon (or *Satiræ*) of Petronius, 27 *et seq.*
Savage, Miss Eliza Mary Ann, 50 *et seq.*, 58
Schumann, Frau, 309
Science and Fruit Growing, 263-83
Sea, The First Phase at, 352-73
Sea power, alleged misuse of, by British, 144, 152
Shipping—State control, 200
Sichel, Mr Walter, *quoted*, 83
Sinclair, Miss May, 314
Smyth, Dr. Ethel, *Impressions that Remained*, 303-17 *passim*
Snipe—drumming, 75
Snowden, Mr. Philip, *quoted*, 376, 400
Socialism—
Church and Socialism, The, 1-25
Discontent in Industry, 393-408 *passim*
Government and Wages, The, 375-92 *passim*
Industrialism in Wales, 136
Nationalisation, 186-208
Some Feminine Autobiographies, 303-17
Sonnino, Baron, 213, 220 *et seq.*
South Wales Miners' Federation, 136
Spee, Admiral von, 357, 361
Starlings, 73
State enterprise, failure of, 186-208
Sterne, Laurence, 88
Straker, Mr. W., *quoted*, 205
Streatfeild, Mr. R. A., 51
Stukely, William, 79
Supilo, Frano, 214

Supply system—Parliamentary control, 166-85
Swann, Rev. N. E. Egerton, *quoted*, 17
Syria—Field-Marshal Lord Allenby's campaign, 115 *et seq.*; economic and social effects, 119; future administration, 130

Tardieu, M. André, 226
Tar water, 88
Tawney, Mr., 6, 12
Taylor, Mr. Stirling, *quoted*, 204
Teddington, 78-96 *passim*
Telegraphs—mismanagement, 194
Telephones—mismanagement, 194
Thaun, Philippe de, 349
Thekla legend, The, 344
Thetbaldus, Abbo, *Liber Fisiologus*, 349
Thomson, Capt., 87
Thorburn, Mr. Archibald, *British Birds*, and *A Naturalist's Sketch Book*, 63-77 *passim*
Thrushes, 70
Tilby, Mr. A. Wyatt, **The Will in Nature**, 284-302
Tirpitz, Admiral von, 360 *et seq.*
Titmice, 68
Tittoni, Signor, 226
Tonypandy Reform Committee, 376
Tourville, Admiral, 357
Trades Disputes Act, 375
Trades Unions—effect of industrial movement in Wales, 136 *et seq.*
Trades Union Congress—decision against direct action, 393
Transport—relation to fruit growing, 270
Treasury—control over finance, 172, 183
Treitschke, *quoted*, 146
Trieste, 215 *et seq.*
Troubridge, Admiral, 372
Trumbic, M. Ante, 214
Typhoon, 325
Tyrol, Southern, 222 *et seq.*

Unemployment, labour fear of, 403
Unemployment Insurance Bill, 404
United States—and the Adriatic Question, 219 *et seq.*; and the League of Nations, 235 *et seq.*; **England and America**, 251; Irish propaganda, 257
Foreign policy—limited power of the U.S.A. Government, 260
Usury, 142

Vattel, Emerich de, 152
Vegetable Statics, 80
Ventilation—Stephen Hales' inventions, 86
Verona, Congress of, 155
Victory, 330, 334
Vienna, Congress of (1814-15), 154, 236
Vigani, Professor, 79

Wages, The Government and, 374-92
Wales—
Industrialism in Wales, 134-42
Ministry—no longer an attractive calling, 139
Walpole, Horace, *quoted*, 90
Warblers, 71
Way of All Flesh, The, 50 *et seq.*
Wealth, distribution of—misconceptions as to, 13
Westlake, Professor, *quoted*, 244
Winchester, Bishop of, *quoted*, 6
War—its spirit and function in history, 233
War, the Great—
Adriatic Question, 209-31
Blockade policy—effect on American trade, 254
'Encirclement' of Germany, alleged British policy of, 143, 164
Naval operations—**The First Phase at Sea**, 352-73
Palestine and Syria—Field-Marshal Lord Allenby's campaign, 115 *et seq.*
Peace treaties, 234 *et seq.*
Ward, Mrs. Humphrey, 306
Washington, British Embassy at—its limitations, 252; suggested appointment of an American specialist, 253

Wellington, Capt., 272
Wheatear, 71
White, Gilbert—on Rev. Stephen Hales, 80, 95
Wilcox, Ella Wheeler, *The Worlds and I*, 303-17 *passim*
Will in Nature, The, 284-302
William II., late German Emperor—memorandum to Herr von Bethmann Hollweg (July 30, 1914), 143; interference with German Fleet during Great War, 360
Williams, Mr. Orlo, **Some Feminine Autobiographies**, 303-17
Willow warblers, 71
Wilson, President Woodrow—and the Adriatic Question, 210 *et seq.*, 220 *et seq.*
Woburn Experimental Fruit Farm, 264-84
Woffington, Miss Margaret, 78
Wood, Sir Henry Trueman, *History of the Royal Society of Arts, quoted*, 93
Woodpecker, lesser spotted, 70
Wood warbler, 71
Worcestershire—fruit growing, 267
Wrens, golden crested, 69

Young, Rev. Edward, 88, 94
Youth, 327
Yugo-Slavia, the Adriatic Question, 209-31

Zia-ud-din Ahmad, Dr.—supplementary note to Calcutta University Commission's Report, 113

Printed in Great Britain at The Darien Press, *Edinburgh.*

157534

P
LE Edinburgh Review
E Vol. 231. Jan.-Apr. 1920.

University of Toronto
Library

DO NOT
REMOVE
THE
CARD
FROM
THIS
POCKET

Acme Library Card Pocket
Under Pat. "Ref. Index File"
Made by LIBRARY BUREAU